The Nation

Vol. CIII NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1916 No. 2687

Summary of the News

Perhaps the most startling diplomatic document since the Austrian ultimatum to Servia was the President's note sent last week to the belligerent nations, calling upon them to state the terms on which, in their view, the war might be brought to an end. The note was dated December 18, and was dispatched on the following day, but was not made public until December 21. In essentials, the note was identic as sent to each of the belligerent Powers, only the preamble differing slightly as it was addressed to the Teutonic group or to the Entente. Disclaiming any connection between the present move and the recent proposals of the Teutonic Powers, the President pointed out that "the objects which the statesmen of the belligerents on both sides have in mind in this war are virtually the same," and suggested that the time had come for a clear statement from all the belligerents of the aims for which they were fighting. Particular emphasis was laid in the note on the situation of neutral nations, especially of the United States, "whose interests have been most seriously affected by the war and whose concern for its early conclusion arises out of a manifest necessity to determine how best to safeguard those interests if the war is to continue."

The effect of the note was rendered more startling, though not, it is generally admitted, more felicitous, by two explanatory statements issued by Secretary Lansing on the day of publication. The first statement, that "we are drawing nearer to the verge of war ourselves, and therefore we are entitled to know exactly what each belligerent seeks, in order that we may regulate our conduct in future," caused something like a panic in Washington and sent the financial market crashing downwards. The second statement, designed to explain the first and containing an expression of regret for the "wrong impression" that had been given, asserted that it was not intended "to intimate that the Government was considering any change in its policy of neutrality." On the whole, it is generally conceded that the two statements served to obscure rather than to illuminate the issue.

The confusion was reflected abroad, one paper, for instance, inquiring whether the United States was making up its mind to enter the war and was only anxious to determine which side it should support, but the general tendency has been to take the note at its face value, ignoring explanations. From the countries of the Entente the almost unanimous verdict appears to be that, while the President's sincerity and good intentions may not be called into question, the dispatch of the note at this time, in view of the German peace proposals, was peculiarly untimely, while criticism is also directed against his apparent ignoring of the moral question at issue between the two groups of belligerents. It cannot be said that any sign has appeared in any of the Allied nations of a disposition to accept the President's invitation, a common comparison being with Lincoln's attitude towards European mediation during the Civil War. In Germany, as was to be expected, the note has found more popular favor, although opinion there is by no means unanimous, and there has been a recrudescence of the old suspicion of Mr. Wilson's "neutrality." The German official reply, non-committal in character and not over-enthusiastic, was received on Tuesday. From neutral nations only one response has been received as we write, that of the Swiss Government, embodied in a note published in Monday's papers which, after remarking the fact that the two Governments have been "in touch" for a considerable time, pledges the support of the Swiss Federal Council to the President's efforts.

Mr. Wilson's note was timed to anticipate the speech of Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons on December 19. Rejecting the German proposal for a conference as "putting our heads in a noose with the rope end in the hands of the Germans," the new British Premier gave as the terms on which the Allies would discuss peace "complete restitution, full reparation, and effectual guarantees." From the Premier's concluding words on the subject it seems evident that the formal reply of the Allies will leave it open to Germany to state any specific terms of peace which she may have in mind.

Interest in the peace proposals being predominant, that which would otherwise have been manifested in the programme of the new British Ministry has been somewhat obscured. The main items in that programme as outlined by Mr. Lloyd George were: The small War Cabinet as a means of securing rapid decision; the nationalization of shipping; regulation of the food problems; further checks on excessive war profits, and mobilization of labor by means of universal national service, voluntary if possible, if not by compulsion. Parliament was prorogued on December 22, the King's speech on that occasion being confined to emphasizing the necessity for the "vigorous prosecution of the war."

It was to be expected that Mr. Lansing's first explanatory statement should be read in connection with recent activities of German submarines and rumors of a more formidable campaign in contemplation. Whether or not such an association of ideas is well founded, it is evident from the issuance of new regulations governing British and French shipping that an intensified submarine warfare is expected. It was announced on Sunday that the British Admiralty had placed a ban on all reports of sailings or arrivals of British ships, and on the same day the French *Journal Officiel* published a decree permitting the state alone to charter shipping, which was interpreted as meaning that a system of convoys would be adopted. It is also reported, apparently on good authority, that the British Government contemplates arming the big transatlantic liners fore and aft and diverting them from New York to Halifax. A significant indication of future policy in undersea warfare is the decision of the German Government in the case of Capt. Blaikie, commander of the Caledonia, who was taken prisoner by the submarine which sank his ship. Capt. Blaikie, it is announced, is not to be shot, as was Capt. Fryatt, because the German Government has now taken the position that British armed merchant steamships are auxiliary cruisers, and consequently their commanders are entitled to the privileges of combatants.

In regard to the numerous cases of submarine attacks under discussion between the State Department and the German Foreign Office, we need only briefly record the following: The German Government's explanation to the United States of the sinking of the Columbian was contained in dispatches from Berlin of December 19; the State Department announced, also on the 19th, that Great Britain had furnished complete explanation showing that the Marina was not in the service of the British Admiralty; a dispatch from the American Consul at Malta on December 20 in regard to the sinking of the Russian stated that the ship was not under Admiralty charter, and the State Department is conducting further inquiries; a communication was received from the British Government on December 23 stating that the Arabia had at no time been used as a transport by any of the Allied Governments. Since we wrote last week some twelve vessels have been reported sunk by submarines.

Dispatches from Paris seem to indicate that M. Briand has successfully weathered the storm which lately raged about his Ministry. The new Minister of War, Gen. Lyautey, apparently receives almost dictatorial powers in all matters that concern the preparation and carrying on of the war, and this, it is thought, is likely to satisfy the public demand for greater concentration in the conduct of military operations. The Senate on December 4 gave the Briand Ministry a unanimous vote of confidence, at the same time unanimously recording its judgment that France could not discuss peace so long as an enemy soldier was on French territory.

News of any definite character from Greece has been scant. A rather curious note sent by the Royal Government to the Entente Powers was published on December 19, which protested strongly against the sympathetic treatment accorded the Venizelists by the Allies. Presumably the information contained in Mr. Lloyd George's speech of the same day, that the British Government had decided to recognize the agents of "that great Greek statesman, M. Venizelos," will have supplied a sufficient answer to this protest. Dispatches from London of December 21 stated that a new note had been presented by the Entente to Greece, demanding the control of telegraphs, posts, and railways, the release of all Venizelist prisoners, the prohibition of meetings of reservists, and an inquiry by a mixed commission into the disturbances of December 1 and 2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week

It is impossible to sever President Wilson's appeal to the European belligerents from the pending movement for peace. This at least presented itself to him as the strategic moment. He disclaimed any connection with the "overtures of the Central Powers," and his note bore evidence of having been written, in good part, some time ago; but opinion in Europe, and opinion here, has inevitably related the step which he has now taken to the great events of the past week. Whether it would have been wiser for him to make earlier the suggestion which he declared he had "long had it in mind to offer," it is now vain to discuss. The thing has been done. The President of the United States has thrown all his weight on the side of peace. In his words of appeal, the peoples of Europe will see the desire of this country that a way be found to end the bloodshed and devastation. The President is not intervening. He is not even proposing mediation. He simply makes a gesture, visible across the oceans; and it is a gesture of peace.

Mr. Wilson spoke of his "great object." This it is needful to hold clearly in mind. M. Gabriel Hanotaux, in his recent discussion in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of the aims of the Allies, asserted that they were striving for a "bonne paix" and also for a "bonne Europe." President Wilson would amend that by adding a "good world." Beyond the settlement of the present war, he is looking forward to world-agreements which will be a bulwark to the weak, a very shield of justice, and a guarantee, the best that mortal men can frame, of enduring peace. Herein lies the greatest significance of the President's approach to the warring Powers. He holds before them the hope of a world in which such a war as this can never again be kindled. It is a magnificent aspiration.

That is not a militant criticism which the Berlin *Vorwärts* brings to bear upon Lloyd George's reply to Bethmann-Hollweg. There are phrases that seem to carry an extraordinary implication, as when *Vorwärts* says: "The real reason for his refusal of our offer is that Germany wants to negotiate rather than to surrender unconditionally." Negotiate rather than surrender is quite a different alternative from negotiating or pressing on to complete victory as the German Government professes to view the situation. And again: "The British Premier has shown the falsity of the allegation that the only obstacles to peace are Germany's refusal to negotiate and the abandonment of annexations." Here the abandonment of annexations by Germany is taken for granted as part of the Chancellor's proposals. If it be recalled that *Vorwärts* has recently passed from the control of the radical Socialist minority and is now edited under the official censorship of the parliamentary Socialist majority which has stood by the Government from the first, the plaintive tone of the protest is certainly remarkable, if not significant. Paraphrased the two quotations would run as follows: "We want no annexations, we are anxious to negotiate, but because we won't surrender unconditionally, Lloyd George won't listen to us." Is this the real state of the German mind behind the victor's chant in the German Government's offer?

Is it possible to find in Germany's peace utterances, official and non-official, some basis for conjecture as to the terms Berlin has in mind? One might try. The note to the Entente Powers declares: "Our aim is neither to shatter nor to annihilate our adversaries." Now among these adversaries is Servia, as well as Belgium; taken together with *Vorwärts's* disavowal of plans for annexation, the Chancellor's statement ought to imply that Servia is not to lose its existence, though it might be punished without being actually shattered or annihilated. Just how far that punishment could go, without amounting to annihilation, is probably one of the questions which Germany would debate in conference. Only it is obvious that whereas Russia might lose Poland and Lithuania without being shattered, Servia cannot lose both Macedonia and Nish without being virtually annihilated. Thus one might argue that in the German note the survival of Belgium and Servia and the restoration of the French departments are implied. It is different with Poland. To erect an independent Poland is not to annihilate Russia, on the one hand, and is technically not annexation on the other. Upon such questions the problem of peace may yet centre.

A corporal in uniform arising in the House of Commons to urge that the belligerents be got together for a discussion of possible peace terms—this was the remarkable spectacle in the House last week. It was Hastings B. L. Smith, a Liberal member for Northampton, who spoke, clad in khaki, praising the new Prime Minister's speech because he understood it to mean that the door was not closed upon the German proposal. This seemed to him the "best possible answer," for, in his opinion, if the German proposals should disclose an aggressive purpose, then the German people would realize that they are not bleeding merely for defence. But the striking passage in the corporal's speech was his deliberate assertion that if it were put to a vote of the men in the trenches as to whether or not there should be "a serious effort to get the parties together, then I am certain such a proposition would be carried with substantial unanimity." Equally bold was his statement that he was "not prepared to face the prospects of a military decision unless there is no way out," with his protest against the economic strangulation of Germany after the war. So far as the attitude of the soldiers is concerned, Corporal Smith's position was anticipated by the *Manchester Guardian* in these words:

> There is in this, as in all the countries at war, a great volume of opinion, too little vocal, unfortunately, in favor of a serious effort on the part of European statesmen to put an end to the carnage which is destroying a whole generation of young men who are not in a mood to fight on blindly, killing and being killed for the sake of fighting. . . . If the armies themselves could speak, this volume of opinion would be revealed as even greater and more set than it is in the homes for which those armies, one and all, are longing.

No one can read the account of the condition of the Belgian people, and especially the Belgian children, given in the New York *Times* by George Barr Baker, of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, without having his heart wrung over so pitiful, so appalling, a spectacle. But wringing of the heart is not, in itself, of any avail. What ought to be brought home to the American people—what *is* brought home to them in such a statement as that of Mr. Baker, if people will but stop to think—is that it is easily in our power to rescue these helpless and innocent victims from the worst of their distress, and that we are not doing it. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, this nation has sympathized with Belgium, has admired her heroic sacrifice, has been filled with indignation at the cruel wrong to which she has been subjected—has done everything, in short, except give her material help in a measure anywhere near what is required to meet her direst needs, or anywhere near what it is our plain duty to give. Whether it be $8,000,000 that has been subscribed in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America, as Mr. Baker says, or $10,000,000, as has been stated by others, the amount is paltry. It is unworthy of our position of pre-eminent wealth, our abounding prosperity, our high professions of humanity; it makes a shabby showing when compared with that of other countries laboring under the tremendous stress of war.

In the discussion of Lloyd George's programme for speeding up the conduct of the war, the great failure of the Allies, also the principal cause which brought Lloyd George into power, has received very little attention. And that is the actual conduct of the war in the sense of military operations backed up by diplomacy. The fall of the Asquith Ministry was not brought about by a deficiency in men or in munitions or in shipping or the pressing food problem, though there may have been dissatisfaction with conditions in every one of these fields. It was Rumania that brought about the change in England, and the Rumanian disaster is not to be traced to the problem of men or munitions or ships in England, but to lack of coördination in Allied councils. Did Rumania come into the war too soon, did she send her armies in the wrong direction, was aid promised her and withheld? The Asquith Cabinet was not the only "debating society" from which the Allied cause has suffered. The Allies have done too much debating among themselves. So far as a coördinated diplomacy of war is concerned, the factor of harmony is not so important now; there is only Greece left for Allied diplomacy to busy itself about. But unity in the strategic councils of the Allies is more important than ever. To that task presumably Lloyd George will give his personal and principal attention.

It is the Rumanian fiasco which has brought to the fore the importance of men, munitions, food control, shipping. The hopes of a speedy end to the war aroused by the entry of Rumania have gone by the board, and it is now a question of settling down to a long test of endurance. Comprehensive though Lloyd George's programme may be for the mobilization of England's resources, it shows in some respects a hesitation to go over entirely to the German system of efficiency as embodied in the recent Civic Conscription bill. The conscription idea is still an exotic in England, and always there is the tendency to see if it can be dispensed with; as in Lloyd George's decision to try out the volunteer principle of national war service. More than specific innovations, it is a speeding up which the new Premier should bring to England's internal economy, singleness of policy and administration. In the matter of allocating men among army, munitions, and civil labor, for example, numberless local tribunals have followed their own judgment exclusively, with resultant waste; but the principle itself is not new. The "starring" of men for civic service began early in the recruiting campaign. It is now a question of thorough and intelligent application of accepted principles.

Premier Briand made a clear issue between himself and his opponents in the course of the recent debate in the Senate. Charged with lack of energy in the conduct of the war, he replied that the Government had been hampered by the constant supervision to which it has been subjected by the parliamentary committees. The blame thrown by the parliamentary Opposition upon an unwieldy and spiritless Cabinet is thus flung back by the Premier into the face of his accusers. The obvious rejoinder—it was made by a critic of the Government—is that the previous record of the Ministry has not been such as to invite the delegation of still larger powers to the Cabinet. The situation is different in England, where concentration of power has been demanded by, and granted to, a new Government headed by a man who has been an opponent of his predecessor's war policies. In France, as the opponents of the Government view the Premier's argument, the cure for Briand is apparently more Briand. This they refuse to concede on two grounds: because of lack of confidence in the personnel of the Cabinet, and because of the deep-rooted tradition which goes back to the great Revolution, that the energies of France best manifest themselves in times of need through the summoning of democratic forces.

With regard to the main point of contention in the proposed protocol with Mexico, namely, the withdrawal of Pershing's forces not earlier than forty days after the signing of the protocol, Carranza's views are simple. He would rather have Pershing stay forty weeks in Mexico while his Government is haggling for the elimination of the forty days. It is a point of honor which our own State Department may find it difficult to appreciate, and which the facts in Mexico hardly seem to justify; but that is the Carranza of it. Yet if pride and obstinacy obtain in de-facto headquarters, there is also a sense of prudence; and that is manifested in the report that Carranza's ablest general, Obregon, is about to lay down his duties as Secretary of War for the purpose of taking the field against the Villistas. A smashing campaign against the revival of insurgency in northern Mexico would automatically solve the question at issue between the two Governments. Our own Government is not so concerned with delicate points of "honor" but that the restoration of order in Chihuahua would make an agreement simple by removing the sole reason for Pershing's presence in Mexico. This is the choice which Carranza must make; either he must accept the terms of the protocol, or he must lose no time in bringing all the strength he has to bear on the military situation in the North.

"Neither Mr. Gross nor Mr. Harding was able to tell the committee how much the system proposed would cost." Thus concludes the account of a hearing last week on universal compulsory service before the Senate Committee. Neither has anybody else been able to estimate in the remotest degree what the scheme would cost in dollars alone—to say nothing of its indirect costs. No one, so far as we are aware, has worked out a plan in detail, showing how many hundreds of thousands of acres would be needed for drill grounds to accommodate from 700,000 to 900,000 recruits, nor how many millions of dollars would have to go into barracks, supply depots, clothing, guns, sanitary conveniences, and the thousand and one details of permanent camps. Even if the period of drill should be restricted to six or eight months so that tent cities could be made to suffice, the costs would none the less be enormous. No one has even estimated how many officers such a force would require, and where they could be obtained from in the next twenty years no one knows. The peace establishment of the German army called in 1914 for 36,088 officers to 769,938 non-commissioned officers and men; but the Germans never brought their army up to this strength prior to the war, which began before the last increases could take place. If, as some officers of the War Department say, we should need to train 900,000 a year, we should probably need between 40,000 and 50,000 officers alone, for we have more officers to a regiment than the Germans. When Mr. Haldane's proposals for the reorganization of the British Territorial and Yeomanry forces were laid before the House of Commons, every detail was worked out. To date nothing concrete has been laid before Congress except the sug-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gestion that we adopt the Prussian system of universal service.

The bolting of Mann for Speaker by Representative Gardner makes the chances of the minority leader very slim. It is a question whether, with every Republican voting for him, he could be elevated to the chair; Clark seems certain to be reëlected. But it begins to look as if Mann would have no easy time in retaining his place as head of the minority. Gardner's opposition is due to Mann's scandalous support—as many others of his own party thought it—of the McLemore resolution warning Americans off ships owned in belligerent countries. Whether the action of the Republican leader was dictated by conviction or by "politics" does not greatly matter. It was not the sort of leadership which the Republicans in Congress need. Nor does it stand by itself. The election has revealed how wide still is the gap between the two wings of the party. What happened in the Senate the other day, when half a dozen Republicans refused to vote for Gallinger for President pro tem., even going to the length of putting up a third candidate, may be repeated in the House. Gardner has already started a boom for Lenroot, of Wisconsin, a progressive Republican. The contest over the Speakership next year may prove the first battle in the fight for the control of the party in 1920.

What happened in Ohio on November 7 may be put most strikingly by saying that Wilson broke Roosevelt's record of being the only Presidential candidate to poll 600,000 votes. The President's total was 604,000, which is 4,000 more than the Republican vote of 1904. The figures become even more impressive by comparison with previous Democratic totals. Wilson polled only 423,000 in 1912, which was a drop of no less than 80,000 from the vote for Bryan in 1908. That vote was the high-water mark for Democratic candidates for the Presidency, being 26,000 more than Bryan got in 1896, 28,000 more than he received in 1900, 99,000 more than Cleveland polled in 1892, when he won an elector, and 158,000 more than fell to Parker. Hughes succeeded in polling the full Taft-Roosevelt vote and several thousand more, but his total of 515,000 was 57,000 below that cast for Taft in 1908. Wilson, on the other hand, regained the 80,000 Bryanites of 1908 who "struck" in 1912, bagged 57,000 of the 66,000 Republicans who also disappeared between those two campaigns, and picked up 44,000 voters who had not gone to the polls in 1908—many of them, no doubt, first voters, since the total vote in that year was the largest polled prior to 1916. Yet Ohio is bounded on the north by Michigan, on the east by Pennsylvania, on the south by West Virginia and Kentucky, and on the west by Indiana!

The one thing of which everybody was sure before the election last week in Boston was that the vote against license would be materially increased over that of a year ago. The only question was whether it would rise high enough to overcome the license vote. But despite the stirring campaign, Billy Sunday, and Foss, not only did the license forces win by an unusually large margin, but the anti-license vote fell off 2,000. The vote for license rose from 46,000 to 53,000. The explanation of the result does not lie on the surface. License advocates suggest that the suburban districts, which have banished the saloon from their territory, but which were not so strong last week against license as had been expected, were actuated by fear that a dry city would mean a loss of revenue. But why should this idea have operated this year more effectively than one or two years ago? It would be a tragedy if the animation which the no-license forces threw into the campaign gave this fear a new reality and so drove away thousands of their former supporters. It is significant, too, that all the stir brought only 5,000 more persons to the polls than came a year ago. Thirty thousand registered voters were content to stay at home. Were they indifferent or are they to be counted on the side of license? If the latter, why were they willing to take the risk of seeing their cause defeated? Whatever the explanation, the event is the biggest setback which the prohibition forces have encountered in a long time.

Some Congressmen predicted when the Child Labor act was passed that the children would go from the factory "on to the streets." The *Survey* predicts that they will largely go from one job to another. The States which the fourteen-year age limit most affects are those with the weakest school laws and the least comprehensive child labor laws. The child who leaves the factory next August will find it easy to obtain a place in a bakery or store. It is now estimated that there will be nearly 40,000 children to leave the mines and factories, most of them living below the Mason and Dixon line. Within the next ten months the Legislatures of more than forty States will be in session, and they should strengthen their codes in such ways as may be necessary to assure the benefit which the Federal law was designed to bring about.

Col. Goethals's statement that "we are now operating the Panama Canal at less cost than the revenue received" is true; but operation and maintenance are far from covering all items of expense connected with the Zone. There is the cost of sanitation and government, estimated at a million and a half, the annuity payable to Panama, the amortization fund of one per cent. upon the cost of the canal, and the interest on the $375,000,000 canal investment. Last year the tolls collected amounted to $4,340,000, as compared with expenses for operating and maintenance of $4,065,000. The total expense, bringing in commissariat, the Panama Railway and Panama Railway Steamship Line, the government, and so on, but excluding interest and amortization, was roughly $18,250,000, and the total revenues were roughly $19,250,000. But the amortization fund and interest together would come to $15,000,000 a year. How far even the increased volume of the canal business will go, after the close of the war, towards making the two sides of the sheet balance when all legitimate items are included in the debit column, is a matter for speculation. It has been computed that by 1925 the tolls may amount to $17,000,000 per year, and this would not quite make up the sum required. Col. Goethals thinks that ocean-going ships would pay the Government nearly a third more if methods of computing tonnage were properly revised; and certainly a standard method should be enforced for all nations.

A moving story of distress from central Alabama, where through flood and boll-weevil the cotton and corn crops were practically failures this year, ought to awaken a response in the North—and a prompt response, for the need is urgent. Even white landlords there are mortgaging their plantations to get food and clothing. Some of the negroes, writes a correspondent to the Montgomery *Advertiser*, are catching rabbits as a means of sustenance, some are beating the woods for wild nuts to barter for meal, and some are shivering over stick-fires all night because they have not the bedclothes to lie under. On the farms, states the *Advertiser* editorially, "human beings are experiencing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the gnawing pangs of hunger, and men, women, and children are facing freezing weather in a few rags." A committee distributing help, which can be reached through the *Advertiser*, has found whole settlements every one of whose members needs assistance.

RESPONSES TO THE PRESIDENT.

Switzerland is the first of the neutral nations officially to come to the support of President Wilson in his effort to bring about peace negotiations. The Swiss Federal Council adheres only in general terms, but makes its action positive and hearty. Other neutral countries are confidently expected to add their approval. There is evidently a stirring in Holland and Scandinavia; Spain is considering her attitude; the Vatican is friendly if not yet openly endorsing the President's move; it is reported that several of the South American republics will soon add their approval. A model for them all is set by the Swiss Government, which disclaims mediation, much more anything like an attempt to dictate peace terms, and points to the single great aim, namely, a conferring together of "the peoples now engaged in the struggle," in the hope of arriving at an agreement to end the war and to "reach a lasting peace."

All this must be gratifying to Mr. Wilson, as must also be the responses which have come to him from his own countrymen. Less pleasing is the mixed reception which his note has had in Germany and in England and France. The first and prevailing impulse of the Allies was to resent the President's note. This was partly because of its phraseology and partly because of its following up the German offer so quickly. Englishmen and Frenchmen felt that Mr. Wilson was strengthening the hands of Germany. Germans felt so, too, at first. But time has brought a change of opinion. Early impressions in both England and France have been somewhat modified; while in Germany the Pan-Germanist press and the military party have quite changed front and are now warning against Wilson as a secret friend of the Allies, who is really playing their game. How the balance of this foreign judgment will swing in the next few days it is impossible to foresee. It will be instructive to watch it.

The whole uncertainty as to just what the President's position is does not, it must be confessed, constitute a striking tribute to the care with which his note was drafted. It was not so accurately expressed as it should have been. Proof of this is furnished in a variety of ways. The note itself contains something very like contradictory parts. Its dwelling upon the sufferings of neutrals jarred on many a reader. Moreover, so great was the doubt concerning the President's direct object, and so marked the divergence of view as to precisely where he stood as between the belligerents, that the Secretary of State felt compelled to seek to explain the matter to a puzzled public. The net result was to leave it rather more puzzled than before. This is not a very happy fate for a document so important as the one given out by the President last Thursday. For the purposes of an appeal so momentous words were not given to conceal thought.

The great misunderstanding, the chief resentment not only among the Allies but in this country, has arisen from the President's unguarded language which seemed to imply that he perceives no difference in the moral quality of the various belligerents. That Mr. Wilson did not intend this is certain. The author of the Lusitania notes could not have forgotten them completely. Already there have come from Washington semi-official intimations that the President's thought has been misapprehended. He was confining himself to the statements of aims and hopes *as now made* by the responsible rulers of the several belligerent Powers. This had no reference to the past. Nor was it meant as a judgment upon the spirit and methods with which the war has been waged. On that subject the President, it is hinted, remains of the mind he has had all along; and it is even reported that supplementary instructions will be sent to our Ambassadors and Ministers, giving them one more explanation, in this sense, of a note which should have carried its own clear meaning on its face.

In the entire long negotiation for peace, which we seem to be facing, nothing need be done by the Allies, certainly nothing should be done by the Government of the United States, to allow the German Government to deceive itself about the long road which it has to travel in order painfully to regain its moral standing in the eyes of the world. Germany may have to undergo punishment of various kinds, but the severest, the long-continuing, penalty which her rulers have brought upon her, will be the abiding abhorrence of the civilized world at the way in which the German Government began the war, and the atrocities committed in the course of it. The Paris *Matin* recently had an imaginary conversation between Bethmann-Hollweg and the Emperor. "See," said the Chancellor, "all my speeches and interviews designed to conciliate the United States! The total is colossal, but I have accomplished nothing." "Perhaps you would have done better," replied the Kaiser, "if you had, at the beginning of the war, left out a half-dozen phrases." For our part, we hope that no American will forget or too lightly pardon the act of perfidy with which Germany began the war, or the lawlessness and brutality with which she has stained her course in it.

SECRETARY LANSING'S BLUNDER.

It is not necessary to produce proof of the huge mistake which Secretary Lansing made last week. He himself admits it. It lies confessed on the face of his two statements. Probably no Secretary of State ever had to undergo so mortifying and humiliating an experience. To speak for the press without weighing his words, and then in two or three hours to be compelled to acknowledge his indiscretion—who could have imagined Robert Lansing capable of it? It was the general belief in his exceptional competence which caused something like consternation at his utterances. For it was no haphazard and improvised diplomat who was talking. It was a trained man who had for nearly two years, in a series of singularly trying situations, shown himself not only able but remarkably discreet. This is what deepens the mystery. We can think of no explanation unless it be that Mr. Lansing's persistent poor health had temporarily impaired his judgment.

With his second statement eating up his first, it is not worth while now to pursue the extraordinary implications of the first. Of these the most astonishing was that neither the Secretary nor the President regarded the note to the belligerents as "a peace note"; along with the inference, which Mr. Lansing's words almost forced the reader to draw, that our Government was considering the question with which set of the hostile Powers we should align ourselves in the war. The effect of this could not fail to be most unhappy, both at home and abroad. It made it look as if the Administration did not know its own mind. And the immediate result is certain to throw an air of uncertainty and confusion over the entire approach of the President to the belligerents in the interest of peace. For the time being, Mr. Wilson's note is necessarily obscured, and the attitude of our Government made to appear muddled. This need not last. The President himself may say something to set

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the matter straight. Or the thing may clear itself up with time, as it becomes plain that the Secretary's blunder was off his own bat, and merely a sign that he was losing his grip. This aspect of the affair is painful, and it is needless to dwell upon it.

The net impression caused in Europe cannot be favorable to American diplomacy. Never has our State Department had so many dealings with foreign Governments, in the same space of time, as with Great Britain and Germany during the past two years. In most of the diplomatic negotiations and statements, during that period, Secretary Lansing has borne a leading part; so that there is a peculiar appositeness in the review of "American Diplomacy in the European War" which Prof. Munroe Smith has just published in the *Political Science Quarterly*. It is an article at once considerate of the difficulties confronting our Government and critical in its estimate of the steps actually taken. Written with broad knowledge and in an admirable spirit, it attempts to lift the whole question out of party politics, and to study it in the light of accepted principles of international law, and also in the hope of indicating precedents set for the future development of that law.

Professor Smith indicates certain policies which he thinks our Government should have announced and adopted early in the war. These do not include a protest against the invasion of Belgium. Professor Smith is not the man to ignore the unwisdom of such a course. But he suggests that the President ought promptly to have called Congress together so as to have put the country on guard, in a military sense, and also to provide himself with legislative weapons, such as authority to lay an embargo, with which to maintain his diplomatic positions. Professor Smith frankly admits that these are after-thoughts, and does not blame the Administration too severely for not having foreseen everything. As regards the things actually done by our Government, he gives approval, on the whole, to its contentions in the matter of restraints of our trade by Great Britain. His conclusion is:

> The conduct of our diplomacy as regards Great Britain and its allies is, I think, fairly defensible. It has not seemed to our Government either necessary or expedient to meet the restrictions placed by these states on our trade with retaliatory restrictions which, in harming them, would also harm ourselves. It has seemed sufficient to file our protests as a basis for subsequent claims. After the war the British Government may concede that its measures were irregular; and the rules of international law will then be vindicated. Great Britain may be the readier to do this because in future it may need these rules for the protection of its own trade. It may the more easily do this because its action is claimed to be retaliatory.

The more complex and perilous dealings of our State Department with Germany, Professor Smith finds vulnerable. He points out the vacillations and lack of a definite and consistent policy in the matter of the limits of submarine warfare. His own opinion is that our Government should have firmly held to the view, which it seemed to take in the first Lusitania note, that a submarine could not comply with the rules of cruiser warfare. And he has no difficulty in pointing out the glaring inconsistency of Secretary Lansing's notes about the rights of armed merchantmen. Particularly instructive is Professor Smith's article in the matter of reprisals; and the assertion of our Government that they are "illegal" he shows to be far too sweeping and, in its extreme form, "quite indefensible." Throughout, Professor Smith's tone is judicial and his learning ample. While we should not subscribe without reservation to all his positions, his article is well worth reading both for its contents and its timeliness.

CONSCRIPTION.

In 1898 the United States was peaceful and content with an authorized regular army of 25,000 men. To-day, our professional soldiers, not satisfied with the regular army of 223,580 men authorized by Congress at their request only six months ago, and not waiting to see if they can raise it, are now going the entire length possible—they demand universal service to provide three millions of men ready to take the field. More than that, they out-Prussian the Prussians, whose military scheme has never included any standing army of professional soldiers; they demand a standing force of 250,000 regulars in addition. When Germany wished to take part in the Boxer troubles in China she was compelled to raise regiments for that oversea duty. We are to have 250,000 men at all times available for that kind of service. Into this revolutionary change in our national life we are to be driven hot-haste without stopping to count the cost—the political, or social, or moral cost. For it is obvious that if we are to embrace universal service, after the manner of France and Germany, the chief emphasis of American life will hereafter be laid not upon the things of peace, but upon the preparations for war.

Now, to justify so radical a revolution in our national life, it would seem as if there should be at least as grave a national danger confronting us as led Prussia to devise her universal service—which is what the Allies are now trying to destroy. There is no danger whatever confronting us either to the east or to the west that is not as capable of diplomatic solution as have been all the others of our national life—which we have solved so successfully as never to have had a foreign war save of our own seeking. But our military men are for ever conjuring up some of these dangers; since 1898 Japan and Germany have been the ostensible possible enemies. Gen. Scott has spoken of the menace of Japan and Great Britain combined. If this does not have the desired effect, the General Staff can be relied upon to add at least Russia, or China, to the combination.

It seems obvious that before the United States makes a plunge into militarism by adding universal service to a great regular army and to the second largest navy in the world, the following steps should be taken as reasonable and business-like: First, there should be no action until the outcome of the war is settled, for there are already plain indications that some of the nations engaged will be ready to consider disarmament and the abandonment of universal service. Secondly, it should be clearly known what we are to arm for; that is, whether we are to rely upon the second largest fleet and the costliest coast defences in the world for safety, with a reasonable army, or whether we are to count our vast fleet as incompetent to defend us, and the coast defences as so much money thrown away. Thirdly, we should have a settled foreign policy into which, if disarmament fails and the American people wish to have a large army and navy, a reasoned scheme of national defence shall fit.

Fourthly, we should not discard the regular-army plan voted last summer until it has been definitely ascertained that it cannot be carried out. There has not been time to test the provisions for vocational training in the Defence law, or even to put them into effect; so able a student of affairs as ex-Secretary Fisher believes that the army can be recruited if higher wages are paid, and the Adjutant-General reports for November a marked increase in recruiting which leads him to believe that the army will be up to the required strength by June next, when the next increase in strength is due. Fifthly, taking note of the many defects and inefficiencies of the army, Congress should build no new and vast militaristic structure until the existing methods are subject to rigid scrutiny and reform and the existing personnel is held to the same standards of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal efficiency that obtain in any large industrial corporation. No universal army, officered and managed as is the present regular army, will yield any sound reason for the belief that it will correspond to the efficiency of Germany or to that of France save in mere numbers.

Sixthly, the National Guard should not be simply scrapped. The several States are entitled to their troops as State forces, and their former status as State troops, and not as Federal militia, should be restored. Under the Dick law these organizations were steadily advancing in efficiency; the mobilization, for all its shortcomings—a considerable portion of which are attributable to the army—was a thousand per cent. better than that of 1898. Seventhly, there should be a careful study of the arguments against compulsion; if we blundered in the hasty legislation for preparedness of last winter we should take seven years at least to thresh out the issue of universal service. If it took us twenty-five years to reform our banking and currency laws, it should not be unwise to devote a good deal of thought to this hasty panacea—all the more so as no one to our knowledge has as yet worked out any detailed plan which in remotest degree counts the cost or shows how universal service should be administered—especially in the matter of the colored men of the South.

We are firmly of the belief that any such detailed study of the proposal for universal service will show (1) that it is utterly un-American in its every tendency; (2) that it would be a menace to our democratic institutions; (3) that it is practically unworkable; (4) that it is totally unnecessary.

REPUBLICAN REFORM FROM WITHIN.

Senator Weeks must have been listened to last week with mingled feelings by the "partisan organization meeting" at the Republican Club of New York city. His urging of efficiency in campaign methods would strike a popular chord—everybody has a soft place in his heart for efficiency—but it is not difficult to believe that he "caused some surprise" by what he said about campaign contributions. Any Republicans who are in the habit of giving large sums, and who felt like welcoming his denunciation of the practice of asking or accepting such aid, must have felt a chill when they heard his reason for freeing them of the burden. The practice is wrong, the Senator told them, "because it gives certain men the belief that they are entitled to unusual consideration after election." What, they must have asked one another in astonishment, does Mr. Weeks think the Republican party is for? If "going downtown" in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Boston with increasing frequency as a campaign nears its end is to be abolished, what radicalism is the party not prepared to take up?

It is, of course, too much to expect that Wall Street should have more than the haziest notion of the taint which its touch puts upon anything—in the eyes of the West. Senator Weeks might have gone so far as to inform his audience that the idea that Wall Street was behind their late candidate was not the least of the causes of his defeat. Fewer tens of thousands of dollars would have meant more tens of thousands of votes. They may well reflect, too, that the unpalatable advice about campaign funds came, not from a wild-eyed Kansan, but from sober, rock-ribbed, or almost rock-ribbed, Massachusetts. This is significant. An Eastern voice answers the Western voices which are half-clamoring for reform, half-threatening what they will do if they do not get it. A Senator from the State of Henry Cabot Lodge and W. Murray Crane actually speaks in a language which Iowa and California can understand. Reform of the Republican party from within, and reform without a bitter fight which would leave the party too weak to engage the enemy successfully, looks more like a possibility when a New Englander speaks coldly of Wall Street's value as a Republican asset. This is the kind of thing which Western Republicans mean when they talk of "progressive policies." And it is men who preach such doctrines with fervor that they more and more incline to support, even though the names may not happen to be found under the emblem which the Western Republican has been accustomed to regard as sacred.

But not all that Senator Weeks said will fire the Western Republican heart. When he declared, "I never have, and I do not now, favor primary legislation," he did not speak the conviction of multitudes of Republicans everywhere, without whose votes there will be no more Republican Presidents. He showed more candor than wisdom in avowing that he had always believed that "the best way to select men to lead a political party was through an assemblage of leaders who know the characteristics and the adaptability of the candidates—qualities about which the general run of voters are ignorant and cannot know." This will not go down west of the Mississippi, nor in all Republican centres east of it. There, too, the belief which Mr. Weeks professes was once held, but the very rock upon which his party split is the abandoning of this and other similar beliefs. To such Republicans, this utterance will be not a declaration, but a confession. Even those most ready to admit the serious defects of the primary system in both theory and practice will still insist that as between the convention system with its faults and the primary system with its, no progressive, whether Republican or Democrat, can hesitate. The task in this matter is not to end the primary, but to mend it. Senator Weeks does not speak with the national Republican voice when he condemns it utterly, but only for a section, and a minority section at that.

This fact lends unwitting emphasis to his statement that the restoration of the Republican party to power is a "man's job." That is a phrase which the most insurging Westerner would repeat after him with peculiar force. By it he would mean a job for a man big enough to see all the way from Eastport to San Diego. The first thing such a man would see is that Republican victory is conditioned upon Republican unity. Now, that unity is not to be obtained by any such mechanical process as the general overhauling and reorganization of methods upon which Senator Weeks laid stress. Not methods, but principles, is the motto of the irreconcilable Westerners. To them, the primary is precious because it is the only method they know of for insuring democratic control of the party. They are not troubled over the trifling question of a little more or a little less efficiency. Their concern is with the prime matters of party faith and party leadership. And their impatience and despair arise from the apparent failure of men like Senator Weeks to grasp that outstanding fact. Unity must come before victory, but principles come before unity. Reform from within or further defeats from within are the alternatives facing conservative and progressive Republican alike.

VARIOUS WAYS WITH FIGURES.

"The population of the United States," says a press dispatch, "continues to shift to the cities, according to estimates announced to-day by the Census Bureau. The estimates, based on the rate of population increases, from 1900 to 1910, disclosed that 40.9 per cent. of the country's inhabitants now live in cities of more than 8,000, as against 38.9 per cent. in 1910." The first

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentence of this is a specimen of that curious crop of statements which makes its appearance every year at this season, as to what has been going on in this country in the year about to close, or in the period since the last census was taken. Of course nobody knows, and the Census Bureau neither knows nor pretends to know. All that it does is to make an arithmetical calculation which any schoolboy could make, and tell us what the figures of any particular matter are to-day if the trend shown in the decade from 1900 to 1910 has continued at the same rate since 1910.

The second sentence in the above dispatch plainly implies this, and yet it did not suffice to prevent the assertion in the first that "the population of the United States *continues* to shift to the cities"—an assertion which, as it happens, is in all probability true, but about which the Census Bureau knows no more than the first man you meet in the street. But usually statements of this nature appear in the newspapers without any indication of how they were arrived at, and they frequently give rise to solemn conclusions which have absolutely no basis whatever—such as that the war has not impeded this or that process, or has not accelerated such and such a tendency. Everybody ought to have sense enough to know that the Census Bureau has no means of getting at the facts of population between censuses, and that no hocus-pocus of mathematics can possibly give any information as to any new factors that may have come into the situation. But most people, when they see anything statistical, either refuse to have anything to do with it or else swallow it whole without stopping to think. Accordingly, the Census Bureau ought to print, in bold type, at the head of every bulletin or leaflet giving figures of this kind, the warning that they are compiled merely to save the labor of calculation for anybody needing estimates of this nature, and that they give no new information as to actual facts.

In this matter, it is clearly nothing but thoughtlessness that is responsible; and the newspaper man has the very strong excuse that statistics are not in his line, and he can hardly be expected to avoid their pitfalls. But it is more difficult to explain, and more uncomfortable to encounter, serious statistical breaks in the utterances of men speaking as experts or high authorities. Such a break occurs in the following extract from the address delivered by Mr. E. E. Rittenhouse at the recent meeting of the Association of Life Insurance Presidents in this city:

> He [the average American] has ignored the fact that the injurious effects of such common stimulants as alcohol, nicotine, caffeine, and similar "bracers" differ only in degree from those of opium, morphine, cocaine, heroin, and other powerful and deadly narcotics.
>
> He has, therefore, increased his annual consumption of alcoholic drinks from 6.4 to 19.8 gallons (per capita) since 1860.
>
> He tells you of the good times he has on these 19.8 gallons. But his over-strained kidneys, heart, and other organs do not rejoice with him.

Now, Mr. Rittenhouse must know that in 1860 beer-drinking was almost unknown in this country, outside of a small fraction of the population, while now it constitutes an overwhelmingly large proportion of the total consumption, and yet he gives no warning whatever to his audience that the tripled consumption of *alcoholic drinks* does not mean a tripled consumption of *alcohol*. Whether much beer is worse for the kidneys than a little whiskey, we cannot undertake to say; but that a little whiskey is capable of doing far more general harm than a considerable amount of beer is quite certain. What sort of intelligence does a person assume in his audience if he expects it to be impressed with a statement so completely ignoring a vital element in the case?

One trouble about pointing out such things as these is that the impression is likely to be produced that statistics are of no use. Good statistics, carefully and honestly used, are of very great practical value. The country, and the world, is constantly being instructed as to the efficacy of various forms of public effort, and as to the growth or decline of tendencies which it is important to watch, by the evidence of proper statistics properly handled. An instance of such handling is to be found in the careful compilation and analysis of homicide figures for this country, by Dr. Frederick L. Hoffman, which appears in the New York weekly insurance journal, the *Spectator*, every year. The review for 1915, in last week's issue of the *Spectator*, shows the same scrupulous accuracy of statement that has been manifested heretofore, and the accompanying comment is of great interest and importance. We regret to say that its purport is by no means pleasing. "While in other directions," says Dr. Hoffman, "measurable progress has been made in the United States, in the direction of the security of the person there has been decided retrogression." This conclusion is based upon more than one comparison, and perhaps no one of them is entirely convincing taken by itself, but there seems to be no escape from it when the whole of the statistical facts presented is taken into account. Among these facts the most striking is that the number of murderers under confinement was 156 per million in 1910 as against 117 per million in 1890; though here perhaps a considerable element in the matter is to be found in the substitution of imprisonment for capital punishment. But, worst of all, no matter whether we are a little worse or a little better in the matter of homicide than we were ten or twenty years ago, we are enormously worse than other civilized countries—a fact which Dr. Hoffman never fails to bring out with a force that ought to stimulate all-round effort to rid the nation of this stigma.

Americans Flying the Coop—A Morality of Morocco

By STODDARD DEWEY.

Five and twenty years ago I was the guest of a day of an extraordinary American. It was in the home he had built for himself behind one of the narrow, whitewashed-walled, Arab streets of Tangier. In the Paris *Figaro* of Sunday, I see that his grand-daughter has been married there to a French lieutenant in that internationalized zone of Morocco.

The coming of Felix Mathews to Morocco and his sticking there are typical of what may happen commonly when Americans once more are allowed to fly the coop and sail across the ocean, with no Secretary of State to refuse them a passport unless they swear to an *animus revertendi*. Once this was not thought un-American. I remember listening to the tales of such an American who sailed in American ships during the years after we finished up with our embargo and non-intercourse and war of 1812 against England. He found in that unmodern age native Americans scattered unafraid through the four quarters of the globe.

In the tepid sea-trip from New York to Texas we talked while Jupiter Lights were heaving into view. The land opposite was Spanish when he sailed; and his talk roved from China, where he mutinied in his fourteenth year, to California, which was also Spanish then. No one was surprised then to find "Americans voluntarily residing permanently abroad"—a crime apparently now, for one of our past Secretaries of State, who has become a Justice of our Supreme Court, gave instructions that such Americans "forfeit all right to the protection of this Government." The denaturalization of native Americans by refusing them necessary papers of citizenship was not yet supposed to be comprised in the "powers herein granted" by the American Constitution, article one.

My retired sailor friend, Ralph Willoughby, native of the New London coast, spoke regretfully of the "fer-tile valleys" wherein, though foreign, an American of his youth might have settled in peace. In those years of America's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growth through native Americans swarming ever farther, my grand-uncle hunted steadily away from the too rapidly filling East down the Mississippi on to Texas, where he lived to see another Independence Day. He died at peace from American passports, while I am already at my fifth since this war began, what with applications and renewals, and have been obliged to bestow uncounted hours and a full dozen photographs of my face on our State Department in Washington. In that olden, golden age before photographs and protection and the constant clucking home of supposedly free-born Americans to their native coop had been thought out, there was an apposite legend told. A raw British envoy, awaiting audience from a remote Indian rajah, heard some one whistling Yankee Doodle and was ushered into the presence of an American doctor who had wandered thither and been uplifted to the seats of the mighty. When Casablanca, of Morocco, first disturbed our newspapers a few years since, one of my own friends got ashore with his camera amid riot and storm only to stumble into the welcoming arms of one Brown, forgotten American and oldest settler in those foreign parts.

Californi-ay—Californi-ay—
We'll all go a-sailing to Californi-ay!

That was the popular American song when Felix Mathews, American, of Morocco, began wandering to some effect. He called himself a 'Forty-niner, and he was old enough to have been one. He had the good American accent, but I have heard tell of previous Belgian antecedents that might explain the somewhat un-American facility at languages which so helped him to his notable career in Africa.

I do not remember if he came originally to Morocco in our consular service. When I knew him he had been for years American consul-general at Tangier. This was equivalent to minister plenipotentiary and envoy extraordinary of the United States at the court of his Shereefian Majesty Muley Hassan, sultan of Fez, Tafilalet, Marakesh, and Sus. He was perhaps the only one of his class allowed to go up freely to the forbidden city of Fez. The one next favored—his great friend to whom he introduced me—was the Portuguese Minister Colaço, whose family inhabited Tangier for five generations. Like Lord Salisbury, Sultan Muley Hassan recognized that Morocco might become a "storm centre" for Europe. The American, who was always on the spot and further—for he could understand and make himself understood in half a dozen dialects of the tribes of the all but unknown hinterland of Morocco—was a thorn in the flesh of British diplomacy.

Last Sunday, the best men at his granddaughter's marriage were Messrs. White, "diplomatic agent and consul-general" of Great Britain in Tangier, and Harris, correspondent from years immemorial of the London *Times* for all Morocco. The Whites have been British consuls in Morocco since before the time when the American 'Forty-niner came to hand. The American did much, perhaps more than any-one else of his people, to keep the American name and fame and good money-making American trade alive in Morocco; but I doubt if any of his family is in the American service to-day. A daughter, so mutual friends I met years ago here in France had informed me, married some other exotic consul in Saffi down along the coast where American trade, if it is ever to return to Morocco, must pass.

Such "expatriated" families by State Department rules—not by the Constitution of the United States—are no longer entitled to the passports which happen to be the only papers that certify and protect citizens of free America. An Englishman lives in New York half a century and, if he proves his birth in England, gets his British passport; and his passport is good for a long time and does not cluck to him to come home every six months. Italy nearly went to war over one of her natives who had lived fifty years unbroken in Colombia. Only Americans must shut their eyes and swear steadily that it is their "intention" to return to their birthplace for "permanent residence" within a stated term of years—else, no Americans are they in the judicial eyes of our Government.

One such, who for full fifty years had worked at a great and exclusively American business in Paris, said plaintively when he learned what was demanded of him if he was to continue legally an American and be protected as such should Germans come to town: "Have they thought what it is at my age to change habits and cooking?" An honored lady past eighty, whose husband doctored Americans of the colony many years, said with dignity: "I am too old to perjure myself about my intention to do something impossible at my age."

In the present case, President Cleveland was the first to interfere with what he considered an abusive tenure of consular office by an American citizen. He changed the consul of a score of years or so; but, when the successor arrived, the united boatmen of Tangier refused to land him. The storm grew and the President yielded, but only for a time. So the best known foreigner in Morocco, which at that time was not tolerant of foreigners, had to yield his place to some one speaking good United States and, I dare say, doing his best according to his lights.

For America, Morocco was then only an outer corner of the habitable orb of Earth. I do not know how American trade with Morocco has been going since, or if our Government approves of Americans trading there. But British Whites are still there, and I notice that the turnover of British commerce with Morocco has quadrupled in their time. When they began there was no Germany in trade; but the new German Empire had worked up by the time I was entertained by the American 'Forty-niner to one-eleventh of England's trade—and Count Tattenbach was already in Tangier. There he appeared again when, after many years, Germany had succeeded in winning for herself painfully one-ninth of Morocco's commerce and so thought herself accredited to demand the rest by force under penalty of upsetting all who were there so long before her. This political activity of Germany behind her commerce was also found, though better justified, in negotiations of the latest international status of America's neglected foster-child Liberia.

Let us go back to our American who was found to have been too long in a place given by our Government—and to the American trade which he found in Morocco. In the last figures which I have (1912), American commerce is counted for only $250,000 out of a total of $65,000,000 of Morocco's foreign commerce. In the ancient time of my own knowledge, the United States did not figure at all—and yet, under foreign tonnage, there was a large trade owned and directed by native Americans and dating from the days when Decatur and his ships conquered for us the respect of the whole Barbary coast. In old business houses of Philadelphia lie books containing accounts and correspondence of trade with outlandish Morocco; and the 'Forty-niner aided it while preparing his report for the American Geographical Society (1886). Our commercial attaché is now again informed that American trading with Spanish Morocco, since German trade has been stopped, is as easy as selling candy to children.

Paris, December 1.

Notes from the Capital

WU TING-FANG.

Probably no Chinese potentate, military or civil, not excepting even the mighty Li Hung-Chang, could be assured of a larger or more attentive audience in Washington, whenever he opened his lips, than is Wu Ting-Fang, who has just published his little greeting to America on taking his seat as Minister of Foreign Affairs. He is remembered here with a personal regard rarely vouchsafed a foreign diplomatist. His selection to take charge of China's affairs in Washington ranked, in its own way, with the choice of Bryce for England or Jusserand for France; for he had a natural gift, artistically cultivated, for manifesting so lively and intelligent an interest in all our concerns as almost to make one forget that he was not of American extraction. He attended all the college commencements to which he was invited, and did his bit in the oratory appropriate to the occasion, always giving an original twist to his comparison of our methods with those to which he had been accustomed at home. He discussed religious questions with our clergy, uplift problems with our philanthropists, race disparities with our ethnologists; as with the classic philosopher, nothing human was alien to him. One of his favorite dissipations was going to afternoon "at homes" and "coming-out" parties, where the partiality shown for him by the fair was the envy of all the gilded youth, and where he tactfully contrived to avoid giving offence when he abstained from drinking tea brewed in Occidental fashion. With his ingratiating smile and his candid manner of inquisition, he would draw from the most confirmed spinster an unabashed confession of her years, supplemented perhaps by a statement of the reasons why she had remained so long unmarried, or from a young mother the number of her children, the extent of her husband's income, and her ground for hoping to rear a family on so modest an allowance. There was no visible limit to the range of his curiosity, for, as he once put his case to me, "how can one acquire information without asking questions?" One of the caricaturists of the period, under the title, "A Study in Oriental Punctuation," drew a clever likeness of Wu, arrayed in his full Chinese canonicals, in an attitude which, in silhouette, followed the curves of an interrogation point.

It will be noted that, in his message to America, he mentions our press among the forces with which he expects to establish co-operative relations. This recalls one of his most striking peculiarities as a diplomatist. No other foreign minister has ever been so accessible to the representatives of reputable

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

newspapers, or so fearless in talking over any topic of joint interest; and the beauty of it was that his frankness, so far as my memory serves me, was not abused.

In dwelling thus on his free and easy ways, I would not be understood as denying to Wu the secretive instinct supposed to govern or influence all traffic between governments. On the contrary, he was the one man in this country in 1900 who was able to convey messages to the handful of Americans shut up in the beleaguered compound in Peking, and to bring tidings of them out to their friends over-sea. How he accomplished this feat, nobody has ever guessed. President McKinley and his Cabinet would have given a good deal to find out, for the mystery left them for some time in doubt whether the alleged communications were genuine. All the satisfaction they could get was Wu's unswerving declaration that the news he offered them was authentic. It was a feat worthy of the Mahatmas of India, and it raised the prestige of the Chinese Legation to an unprecedented degree.

Naturally, not all Wu's experiences here were free from unpleasant features. Notwithstanding his general success in making his way into people's good graces, he was unable to break through President Roosevelt's armored policy of protection to American labor with his insistence that the anti-Chinese legislation on our statute books was an unjust discrimination against a friendly nation too weak to resent it. Then he gave deep umbrage to that pure and undefiled statesman, Senator Mitchell, of Oregon, in which the tearfully pious Teller, of Colorado, participated, by writing a letter of protest against this same discrimination to the Secretary of State; but to make up for the censures of the Mitchell-Teller combination, he was defended by men of the capacity and character of Senators Hoar, of Massachusetts, and Spooner, of Wisconsin, who asserted, without the dread of an agonized constituency to cow them, that he had acted quite within his province as a diplomatic agent of his government. On one occasion he was subjected to insult and even bodily pain at a public meeting because he ventured to remind a body of labor agitators that there was such a thing as the Golden Rule; but these indignities were compensated in a measure by a polite invitation from an Eastern gathering of trade-unionists to come and address them on a certain festal day, because they wished to hear both sides of the Chinese exclusion question. Speculative grafters lay awake o' nights, after he had become a recognized personage of importance in this country, inventing traps for him, in the hope of making use of so distinguished a name as his in promoting their enterprises. Once or twice he got as far as the edge of one of these shrewdly disguised pitfalls, but escaped in time.

In nearly all outward aspects, Dr. Wu was as different as possible from the present Chinese Minister. Dr. Koo is the most modern of Oriental modernists. He wears the conventional Caucasian clothing, including the glossy top-hat common to the European diplomatists here; and Mrs. Koo's toilets are specimen products of the American dressmaker. Wu always stuck to the flowing robes and buttoned cap of his people, and his wife was the typical mistress of a high-caste Chinese home. There was no effort on the part of either to court the favor of their temporary hosts by imitation in such a matter as costume or manner of living, though joining in, or looking on at, all our American activities with an appearance of sympathetic enjoyment. Their son took a course at an American high-school, and joined an amateur military organization when he reached the required age. Mrs. Wu, whose feet were bound in infancy, set them free after coming here, and, though unable to overcome the effect of their long repression, fixed her face strongly against the unnatural custom among Chinese women; while Wu himself led a campaign against queues, not because of their traditional significance or for any sentimental reason, but because, now that the Chinese are beginning to compete industrially with the peoples of other countries, such an appendage reduces the efficiency and increases the perils of their work. TATTLER.

The Procedure of the British Prize Court

By E. S. ROSCOE.

Legal procedure is a technical and, to the layman, a somewhat uninteresting subject, but it is none the less extremely important to every class of the community. It forms the approach to the Temple of Justice, and this building is of little value if the road to it is either impassable or troublesome. In England this has been recognized for many years, and there has consequently been an endeavor from time to time to improve the procedure of the civil and criminal courts.

Reforms may have been long overdue, and when carried they may have been imperfect, but the whole history of English law shows that changes in procedure have been one of its most noticeable features. The Judicature Act of 1873 and its attendant code of rules were, though their results have in many respects been disappointing, a remarkable effort to improve British procedure. Before and since that date the statute book will be found to contain many acts in reference to legal procedure of a less far-reaching character, but all passed with the same object.

It was, therefore, with some surprise that English lawyers read the attack of the United States Government in the note of November 5, 1915, on the modern procedure of the British Prize Court—for the change from an old to a new procedure was in accord with a legal movement in England which had been continuous though variable in force.

During the Napoleonic war the decisions of the British Prize Court became classical, for Lord Stowell was then creating that collection of prize law which has since been constantly approved by the prize tribunals of the United States. It was in September, 1794—four years before Stowell, then Sir William Scott, became Judge of the High Court of Admiralty—that he, in conjunction with Sir John Nicholl, and at the request of John Jay, then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, drew up and sent to the American jurist a memorandum which contained an outline of the procedure in the British Prize Court. In the Appendix to Wheaton's Admiralty Reports is a note by Judge Story which was afterwards republished with other notes under the title of "Notes on the Principles and Practice of Prize Courts." The first sentences of the main note show how completely the prize procedure of the United States is based on that of Great Britain. "In some of the District Courts of the United States," wrote the eminent American jurist, "(to which courts the exclusive jurisdiction, in the first instance, belongs), irregularities have crept into the practice in prize causes. These irregularities have been censured at the bar, and occasionally noticed, with expressions of regret, by the Supreme Court. It is hoped, therefore, that an attempt to sketch an outline of the regular practice of Prize Courts, in some of the more important particulars, may not be without use to the profession. This outline will be principally copied from the rules of the British courts, which, as far as cases have arisen to which they could apply, have been recognized and enforced by the Supreme Court of the United States; and, for the most part, are conformable with the prize practice of France and other European countries, as will appear by a reference to the laws and treaties quoted in the margin. The letter of Sir William Scott and Sir John Nicholl to Mr. Jay, written in September, 1794, which is printed in the Appendix to Chitty's Law of Nations (American edition), and Wheaton, on Captures, affords, as far as it goes, a very satisfactory and luminous view of the subject."

The whole of this statement is valuable, but especially the words which state that the rules of the British courts "have been recognized and enforced by the Supreme Court of the United States."

At the beginning, therefore, of the nineteenth century, British and American prize procedure was identical. At the beginning of the twentieth century the two procedures were different. While that of America had remained stationary, that of Great Britain had progressed.

When Sir William Scott wrote his historical memorandum on British procedure no code of rules existed—there was only a chaotic mass of material known to the small group of civil lawyers who practiced in the Admiralty, Ecclesiastical, and the Prize Courts. It was based on sections of old statutes, on usage, and on fragmentary rules which had been issued from time to time by the court itself and on the general practice of the Ecclesiastical Courts. This somewhat obscure mass of procedure was becoming almost mythical after the dissolution of the Society of Doctors of Law in 1857, when the Admiralty and Ecclesiastical Courts were thrown open to all practitioners. It was therefore collected by a small official committee in 1897 and published in the Prize Court Rules, 1898—which were promulgated in that year by an Order in Council. But they contained many details of an archaic kind, and, accordingly, in 1910 came the appointment of Lord Gorell's committee, which considered the subject of prize procedure from the point of view of the reformed British civil and commercial procedure, with the result that after careful study and deliberation a new code of procedure—that known as the Prize Rules of 1914—was issued.

The old procedure, as it must be called, contained many details which belonged in effect to the practice of the old Ecclesiastical Courts and are of a very technical kind—such, for example, as monitions and præcipes. It may be said at once that a primary object of the change was the abolition of these anti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quated forms and the creation of a procedure short, simple, and as untechnical as possible. Hence, all proceedings are now begun by a writ of summons, and pleadings have been abolished, except in special circumstances. The largest reform, however, was the abolition of the examinations on standing interrogatories, and of what was known as "the first hearing."

In times when commerce was in an elementary condition an examination of the ship's papers and of the master and one or two of the crew would prove all the necessary facts to justify the capture and condemnation of the vessel, or to establish the right of a claimant to the release of a ship or of its cargo. "The prisoners, or at least two or three, must be brought ashore before an admiral or his vice-admiral or his lieutenant, that they may be examined by him in order to ascertain the country to which they belong and who are the owners of the ships and cargoes." These are, shortly, the words of the French ordonnance of 1584, and they show the germ of the old standing interrogatories of the British Prize Court, the answers to which, together with the ship's papers, formed the ground on which the decision of the court was made.

By the end of the eighteenth century it was found that this primary evidence was often insufficient, and it was then in the discretion of the court to adjourn the case either for further proof or for consideration on the more elaborate machinery of plea and proof. In many cases this practice resulted in two or more hearings, and in considerable and inconvenient adjournments. It was, in fact, already obvious that the old mediæval practice was fast becoming unsuitable to modern circumstances. The Rules of 1914 recognized the commercial changes which had occurred in the last hundred years and allowed the case to be decided, in the first instance, on such evidence as the captors and the claimants might desire to bring to the notice of the court. Each side was at liberty, as in a civil suit or a criminal prosecution, to fortify his case by all the legal evidence he could obtain.

When, therefore, the United States attacked the modern procedure they lost sight of the object of procedure, which is to assist each party to a suit, to bring before the Judge in the clearest way and with the least delay all the relevant and necessary materials on which to base a judgment. If the procedure of the British Prize Court was not to remain an anachronism, an adherence to the old system of primary hearings and a secondary consideration on further proof which produced delays and increased expense, and to the various smaller technical points which had been part of the ecclesiastical procedure of England, was no longer possible. For nearly two years the Prize Rules of 1914 have been in force, not only in the Prize Court in London, but also in the Vice-Admiralty and Colonial Prize Courts in the British Dominions. It is desirable, therefore, that American jurists and legal authorities should carefully examine these rules and their working. The simplification and modernizing of procedure is as important in the United States as in England, and it may be hoped that the prize procedure now in force in British courts will be adopted by the United States in place of that which was followed by them in the days of Stowell and Jay.

London, November 15.

Evidence in Prize Courts

By ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS.

In the article by E. S. Roscoe entitled "The Procedure of the British Prize Court," reference is made to the letter of Sir William Scott and Sir John Nicholl to Mr. Jay, written in September, 1794. Mr. Roscoe seems to think that the prize-court procedure of the present day has been simplified and modernized—that the purpose was to abolish antiquated forms and create "a procedure short, simple, and as untechnical as possible." A consideration of "procedure" necessarily involves questions of evidence, its reception in court, its kind, materiality, and weight.

The letter referred to is in part as follows:

"The evidence to acquit or condemn, with or without costs and damages, must, in the first instance, come merely from the ship taken, viz.: the papers on board and the examination, on oath, of the master and other principal officers. . . . If there do not appear from thence ground to condemn an enemy's property or contraband, goods going to the enemy, there must be an acquittal, unless, from the aforesaid evidence, the property shall appear so doubtful that it is reasonable to go into further proof thereof."

This was followed in the United States in the Dos Hermanos case (1876), 2 Wheat. 76-79.

According to this procedure, unless evidence was in hand at least to raise some suspicion, the ship and cargo were immediately acquitted. If there were doubtful circumstances, the captor might introduce other evidence, but whatever other evidence existed, the Court would not receive it if the ship's papers, the course of the ship, and other plain, definite, unequivocal information on the ship at the time did not give rise to suspicion.

In the case of the Aline and Fanny (1 E. P. C. 537), after asserting that the evidence whether to acquit or to condemn must in the first instance come from the ship's papers and the depositions of the master and crew, the Court stated that the captors could not, except under circumstances of suspicion arising from the primary evidence, adduce any evidence whatever in opposition; and in that case, where no suspicion of an intention to break a blockade appeared from the aforesaid evidence, the Court refused the admission of further proof by the captors. The Court said:

"I cannot require the claimants to produce further proof when already the papers point to a lawful destination, and when all the evidence in preparatory is to the same effect, and the *onus* is on the captors. . . . I consider this to be a case in which the depositions, ship papers, and log, do not afford any ground for suspecting—any reasonable ground for supposing—that this ship was committing a breach of blockade."

We must bear in mind that the primary hearing was to determine, not whether the ship or goods should be condemned, but whether they should be released; there was a secondary consideration only in suspicious cases.

Now, what is the present procedure, which, according to Mr. Roscoe, is "short, simple, and as untechnical as possible"? How does the present system compare with the "old system of primary hearings and a secondary consideration on further proof, which produced delays and increased expense, and to the various smaller technical points which had been part of the ecclesiastical procedure of England"?

The Prize Court Rules of 1914 provide that a case may be heard upon ship's papers, affidavit of officers, depositions of witnesses, and "such further evidence, if any, as may be admitted by the judge."

Instead of an immediate trial of cases on evidence at hand at the time of capture, they are delayed for months while both sides gather evidence, for the owner of a cargo hardly feels secure until his case is in the best possible shape. It is not sufficient for him to supply evidence from America, but some of it must come from the point of destination or the consignee. The prize court admits evidence of quantities of imports into neutral countries, although it is difficult to see upon what theory this would indicate that a particular cargo was intended for belligerent destination. If the consignee has connections in Germany, this is used as evidence of a probable enemy destination of the cargo. In one case of which the writer has knowledge, the consignee of a cargo coming from America had been asked by a South American concern to transmit letters to Germany. He did so. This fact was used as evidence to show that the consignee was a conduit between Germany and neutral countries.

The Order in Council of March 30, 1916, provided that an enemy destination is "presumed to exist if the goods are consigned to or for a person who, during the present hostilities, has forwarded imported contraband goods to territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy." How a shipper sending goods to an individual in Scandinavia can meet a presumption of this kind in prize court, which may arise from business with which he had nothing to do, is difficult to ascertain.

The author seems to regard the changes made as merely in procedure, without realizing how greatly they change substantive and actual property rights. It is true that under the old system frauds were easy, but there can be no safeguard to neutral commerce if ships may be seized on suspicion and the cargoes held while the British Government hunts for evidence. No vessel should be captured unless at the time there was evidence to justify such capture.

Where the captor has evidence derived from cables or letters which were intercepted prior to the seizure, it might reasonably be contended that he should not be limited to that found on the ship, but he certainly should be limited to evidence which was in his possession at the time of the capture. In some cases goods which have been seized on the ground that the ultimate destination was Germany are merely detained under the Order in Council of March 31, 1915; but the prize-court writ is issued alternatively for detention or condemnation, and before the case is tried the Government may find further evidence and proceed to condemn, thus showing that at any rate the evidence on which the proceedings were brought was not at hand at the time of capture. In numberless cases goods are released after seizure. If the captor had been limited to evidence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found on board the ship, or evidence in his possession at the time, the goods would not have been seized at all.

The shipper's evidence is ordinarily that he shipped the goods to Scandinavia on order; that his draft was not paid because the goods did not arrive. The Crown's case usually starts with a general affidavit by the Treasury Solicitor referring to the various parties involved, like this—"John Jones, of America, the shipper, who has offices at 25 Broad Street, New York, is in the same building with Mr. Pumpernickel, who is known to have received cables from Germany. There is supposed to be a close connection between the two." "Mr. Heinrich Larsen, the Swedish consignee of the goods, represented Johann Schmidt, of Hamburg, before the war. He deposits money in the Landskrona Bank, and it is well known that this bank has a large business with Germany." "The Smith Steamship Line, which carried the goods, has heretofore carried contraband cargo." "John Jones's nephew is known to have attended school in Heidelberg, and was in Germany at the outbreak of war. It is supposed that on the way home he stopped in at the Landskrona Bank." "Alvarez & Co., of the Argentine Republic, have heretofore sent letters to Germany through Heinrich Larsen, copies of which letters are shown in Exhibit 1." Exhibit 1 may be made up of various letters which show that Heinrich Larsen had or has business relations with Germany—as if any Scandinavian merchant of any standing had not! Exhibit 2 very likely contains telegrams and cables which have been intercepted, many of them after the transaction involved. These may refer to the particular cargo or not—it is immaterial. There follows an affidavit by an expert on foodstuffs to the effect that the importation of foodstuffs by Scandinavia from America has increased many-fold since the inception of the war. Is it not obvious, therefore, that the particular cargo was going to Germany? Then there may be a further affidavit to the effect that the women and children of Germany are known to be hoping for German success and are starving themselves, so that all food, including the cargo on the steamship "Foolishness," will get to the German army. Of course, the Crown submits other, more material evidence; but evidence of the above kind throws a disquieting atmosphere over the case. Determinations upon inferences have always been found dangerous in a court of law. "Have you a scar on your arm?" said one man to another as he met him on the street. "No." "Well," said the first, "then you're my long-lost brother.

The reason for the delay is that ordinarily before a case comes into court the claimant endeavors by means of affidavit after affidavit to prove his innocence; but since Heinrich Larsen is on the blacklist (not the published one) this is unavailing. Then the shipper is notified that the case is about to come up in prize court. He has asked the consignee to present the case; he does not know whether title is in the consignee or in himself. He says the consignee is liable, since the goods were shipped on order; the consignee says he is not liable, because the goods did not arrive and he has not taken up the documents. Both parties spend some time trying to provoke the insurance company into action. The probability is that the papers have been sent by the consignee, at some stage, to the Danish Legation in London and an appearance has been entered for the consignee. Then the consignee suggests that the American shipper protect his own interest, and an appearance is thereafter entered for the American shipper by a different firm of solicitors. The solicitors then prepare the case for either one or the other, and send on forms of affidavits, drawing particular attention to the fact that the shipper should go into all transactions had with Scandinavia from the beginning of the war, and submit any cables or letters in any way bearing upon such transactions. They usually also ask whether the cargo has been sold by the consignee. The shipper does not know, and tries to obtain the facts from the consignee. If the consignee has sold the cargo, it may be that his customer is under suspicion, so that he would not want to reveal the sale. At any rate, the whole matter is steeped in difficulty. The consignee is asked to show his books. He very likely writes or cables the shipper asking whether he should do so, or else flatly refuses. The shipper goes over his letters and cables to Germany or to the consignee, and bears in mind the fact that one of the cables sent his regards to Rachel Schmidt. Now, then, he wonders whether to produce that cable! The British may look up Rachel Schmidt and find that she lives in Hamburg. Rachel Schmidt might have been a code word. Being in grave doubt, the shipper sends affidavits, leaving out a few letters and cables which may not be material, but which might arouse further inquiry. The papers are forwarded to England; the barrister who is to try the case notes in some letter a reference to a cable that is left out, and sends for further affidavits.

Shippers, knowing the inferences drawn in prize court, are afraid to present their cases. The result is delay and deterioration. Where the goods are seized under the detention order, the shipper knows that the goods (or their proceeds) will be returned after the war. He knows full well, by experience, that under no circumstances will the goods be allowed to proceed—whether the evidence against them is good or bad. He is asked to put up security, even to have a hearing in the prize court. He must bear solicitor's and barrister's expenses. Unless the cargo is a large one, he prefers to let the matter rest.

Obviously, under the old procedure many captors failed to condemn cargoes which, had the full facts been known, might have been condemned; but it was realized that the only safeguard of the commerce of neutrals in time of war lay in quick and speedy action; that commerce could be killed by detention and delay fully as much as by condemnation in prize court. Heretofore neutrals have been able effectively to prevent seizures upon suspicion.

The present procedure might have been simplified by providing that the captor immediately present to the court all evidence which he had against the cargo, so that the shipper might know what case he had to face; but, of course, even that would mean little in view of the inferences to-day drawn by the prize court, and the burden thrust upon the shipper of proving what is substantially a negative—that the goods will not get to a belligerent. The Crown no longer proves a case. The shipper, in a hostile or suspicious atmosphere, must prove innocence. This does simplify matters considerably—for the captor.

Referring to a cargo which was held up for three months without proceedings in prize court (the Madonna del Berso, 1 E. P. C. 370), Sir William Scott said:

"The complaints which such a conduct tolerated by this country would provoke against it by foreign countries, are not to be described; and it is not very easy to suggest how the real honor of the country, connected as it is with its justice, could be defended against such complaints."

This was under the old procedure, which is called "technical," and which involved details such as monitions and præcipes, as opposed to a procedure which Mr. Roscoe says is "short, simple, and as untechnical as possible."

Why is it that in spite of the improvements in methods of communication in the last century, fast mail steamers, cables, the wireless, etc., the delay should be so great? It is because of the complications of procedure—the difficulty of preparing for trial. The parties involved are likely to be in three different, widely separated countries, and communications between the two are likely to be censored by the third. Whatever may be said in favor of general evidence which may bring out the truth in a local controversy, the same considerations cannot apply to cases in prize court. The deficiencies in the old procedure were unquestionably recognized, but from a commercial point of view it was regarded as the only practicable method, and certainly far more desirable than the present one.

The delay is the fault of a procedure which allows seizure upon suspicion, and judgment largely upon inference. If it be said that under the old rules of procedure it would be practically impossible to condemn goods to-day, it might be answered that except in the case of absolute contraband, where a doctrine of continuous voyage applied, it has long been recognized in international law that a belligerent could easily obtain goods through contiguous neutral countries so that a right to condemn those goods was not of any substantial value. We have become so accustomed to interruptions of commerce that we are inclined to forget that the seas are free to all nations, with only narrow exceptions in time of war. To allow belligerents to capture property at all is a concession by neutrals. To-day to allow commerce to neutrals at all is regarded as a concession by belligerents. At any rate, the system of confining evidence to the ship, or at least to the information in hand at the time of seizure, is so necessary to safeguard the rights of neutrals that the new procedure would seem to be of far more inconvenience to neutrals than of advantage to the belligerent.

No diplomatic action, no note written by any government, no change in international law by order in council, has been so important in this war as the short sentence in the British Prize Court Rules of 1914, allowing cases to be heard upon "such further evidence, if any, as may be admitted by the judge." It has meant seizure upon suspicion and the destruction of neutral commerce by detention and delay.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert Underwood Johnson

Poems of War and Peace. By Robert Underwood Johnson. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. $1.

Mr. Johnson, setting out from "Goethals of Panama," traverses embattled Europe in nine "Poems of the Great War," and finds in the concluding section, thirteen "Poems Chiefly of Friendship or Admiration," a "still and calmy bay" in which his war-rent vessel drops a peaceful anchor. The earlier themes are of Cyclopean mass and fibre, and the rumble of invective shakes the lines, but the parting impression is one of delicacy, and even in the war-clangor the tenderness outlasts, if it does not out-soar, the indignation. The reality of the poet's gift seems unquestionable, and, if I were compelled to specify its differentia, I think that some such phrase as crispness in pliancy or precision in mellowness would be the quickest exit from my difficulty. Mr. Johnson is a point-maker; the separable, the emergent, phrase is normal in his craftsmanship. But he is not subject to that law which makes the individualism of points unfavorable to a consecutive or gliding style. Next to sweetness, the property of his music is fluidity, and the rebellious points obey this impulse, as the very pebbles in a brook take on the rounded and fluid curves of the ripples through whose lapse they are visible. I find Mr. Johnson a trifle lax in the point of structural unity; thoughts merely cluster where they should interlock or interflow; even the excellent poem on "Embattled France," of which I now quote as many stanzas as my dread of the scissors of the editorial Atropos will permit, would be still better if it were tightened in the girths.

Across the sea that once was free now let the message leap
That France has won our Western hearts, and waked our souls from sleep;
Proud land! no more shall we mistake the shallows for the deep.

And we who knew and loved her true and shared her welcome kind—
The welcome of her heart, and more, the welcome of her mind—
How could we know these newer bonds that evermore shall bind!—

That she, the Queen of Peace serene, who sought the sword no more,—
That she, the Queen of Art, who keeps the key of Beauty's door,
More royal than her royal lines, should be the Queen of War!—

For, though the years have drowned in tears her thrones and quarterings,
She, kingless, has not lost the proud residuum of kings:
Noblesse oblige is written on every flag she flings.—

Oh, there is calm of Sabbath psalm and there is calm of woe,
And calm of slaves who never the calm of freemen know,
When, though the storm may tear the wave, the sea is calm below.

Upon the air no martial blare proclaimed the fateful call;
No drum need make the summons the spirit makes to all;
Not softlier to the solemn earth the autumn leaflets fall.

With gaze that saw far things of awe she stood as in a trance,
But faltered not before the shock of War's long-dreaded chance,
And every soul was born again—an effigy of France!

O. W. Firkins.

Correspondence

THE RIGHTS OF PROPERTY AT SEA.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In to-day's *Nation* I find in the article entitled "Maritime Tyranny" this paragraph:

"What is meant is a more sure definition of contraband, and, in general, the recognition of the rights of private property at sea in time of war as they have long been recognized on land."

This last assumption has become a commonplace in the argument for the protection of private property at sea, but is it sound? In what wars has private property on land been respected? Certainly not in our Civil War, in the Franco-Prussian War, in the Philippines, in the Balkan Wars, nor by the punitive expeditions in China. Least of all have the Germans respected private property during this war, either in France or in Belgium. I wish the foundation on which this assumption rests could be stated, and it could be reconciled with the facts, such as the sale of Chinese loot in New York after the Boxer insurrection.

Moorfield Storey.

Boston, November 23.

[The general rule of international law was reaffirmed at The Hague, substantially to the effect that private property on land cannot be confiscated in time of war. That the rule has been violated does not make it any less the rule. There is no such rule for private property at sea.—Ed. The Nation.]

THE PRESIDENT'S PEACE MOVE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The President's round robin to the belligerent Powers will be a source of humiliation to Americans who value their country's honor and rights.

The note comes at the moment when Washington had reached an ugly *impasse* on the submarine controversy. The President, by introducing a new and sensational matter of discourse, effects a new evasion.

If your sapient neighbor the *Times* is right in supposing that the real aim is to make Germany show her hand, this could and should have been done directly, and without ambiguous and offensive expressions towards the Entente Allies. It would have been enough to remind Germany that her peace initiative and position of military advantage imposed precise expressions upon her. If this were the intention, the move should have been made collectively by the neutral Powers. This would have given the proposal a moral weight it now lacks. But the President wished to reap single-handed all accruing personal glory.

The requirement that the Allies state their terms categorically, though appparently unfair, is really disingenuous. The peace terms of the Allies will depend largely upon a condition they cannot predict; namely, the state of mind of Germany at the time peace shall be negotiated. The Allied Powers cannot now bet on this sort of an uncertainty.

So far from forcing Germany to show her hand, the note actually makes it possible for her to quibble over the order of negotiation.

The whole clumsy manœuvre gives every evidence of having been made in Germany. They have played on the President's personal vanity, while sidetracking the awkward submarine issue.

It is possible that the move corresponds to the flabby peace sentiment of the country. It none the less aligns us with our contingent foes, embarrasses our friends, and sacrifices for a very doubtful good our urgent rights and interests.

It is plain that nothing but a desperate military outlook would justify the Allies in accepting a peace with a victorious Germany. France and England will live at the sufferance of a predominant Germany only if forced. But nothing is more numerically certain than that three more years of the present wastage will see Germany deficient in man power and fighting within her own borders. Then a real peace may be possible. The President's premature and meddlesome move will go far to rob this country of the prestige it might legitimately have gained, in helping to establish the basis of a lasting peace.

Frank Jewett Mather, Jr.

Princeton, N. J., December 24.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Dean Wigmore's able article in the *Nation* of December 7, which sets up the ideal of judicial immunity as that towards which the teachers and investigators of the country should strive, is interesting. But is that what the country needs? The lawyer and the judge are allowed freedom of speech in their particular spheres and the college professor should be content with a similar privilege.

In the first place the legal ideal is not one of freedom, but of group solidarity. The history of the American bar is sufficient evidence that the profession as a whole has always been on the side of the biggest battalions. In the East its talent was devoted to the industrial masters, in the South to the slave masters, and in the West to the transportation lords. Without arguing this point to meet certain obvious objections, let us see if a profession which in its very nature is attached to the side of the strongest in society can serve as a model for the investigator whom society sets to work, with a very modest allowance, on the great verities of life.

The freedom of the judges is the freedom to pronounce from the bench what is the law in the case; but society is always making new law and the investigator seeks to give it new facts on which to base new law. Is the freedom to express in academic language and only in unread periodicals the results of one's research the freedom which society demands for the scholar, or, let us say, with Dean Wigmore, the privileged professor?

I think not. Such limited freedom would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only lead to group solidarity, smug professional contentment, and perhaps national egotism, such as we had in Germany, where academic freedom was a boast but not a reality. Such a situation for the scholar and the teacher of young men could only lead the United States into a state of self-complacency in which an effective protest would be well-nigh impossible, at least in learned circles. A Luther would be as impossible with us as he would have been in modern Germany. A country rich beyond all precedent needs above everything else some group of people who are restless and yet who have the information and the standing to get a hearing, men with whom discretion is not the first word in the lexicon.

Dean Wigmore's ideal of a divided and strictly inter-professional freedom could not possibly answer this need. Now nobody would regret more than the present writer a tendency among university professors to off-hand and ill-baked advocacy of radical or hyper-conservative ideals. That could lead only to unfortunate results. But it is quite another thing to ask scholars to imitate the American Bar Association, which has never developed a radical, which could not endure the presence of a distinguished negro as a member, and which is to-day our nearest approach to an aristocracy. The university professor in the past has not distinguished himself for the advocacy of reforms of any sort. Shall he now, as he is about to organize in a national association, commit himself to a system which would tie him inevitably to the side of the successful, of the strongest in our life? That is what the judiciary has done, and of necessity had to do, for the maintenance of the law, as I have said, is its business. On the other hand, science, if it be possible to save that branch of human endeavor, ought to seek to make new law, to set men free from the shackles of the law. If that is the social part of their business, then why shall they not speak whenever and wherever they choose and even make fools of themselves as did Christopher Columbus, William Lloyd Garrison, and others?

A COLLEGE MAN.

December 11.

CIVIS MEXICANUS SUM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Ex-President Eliot's assertion that "America has now turned its back on the familiar policy of Rome and Great Britain of protecting or avenging their wandering citizens by force of arms" has not been heartily applauded by all his fellow countrymen. Why was not "Civis Romanus sum," uttered with effect in Gaul or in Persia or in Spain, a perfectly good statement standing for a perfectly good policy? Why not, indeed—provided the Roman was equally affected by the foreigner's statement: "Gallus sum" or "Perses sum" or "Hispanus sum" But the Roman wasn't. The respect for national privileges was not mutual: Rome's policy was one of intimidation, not of fair play, and so pursued could never lead to much more than a smouldering amity.

England has carried on—and bettered—this policy. But only if the statement "I am an Englishman" is expected to win from the foreigner not a jot more of courtesy or consideration or concession than the foreigner's statement "I am a Swede" or "I am a Venezuelan" or "I am a Greek" is England using this policy righteously and in a way that leads to permanent world peace.

We Americans are invited to adopt this policy more strenuously in Mexico, and elsewhere. If we devote ourselves heart and soul to military and naval preparedness, we can probably make our citizens in foreign lands nearly as awesome as Roman or Englishman. It may be that we shall be forced to do this. But are we, more than Roman or Englishman, likely to find this to be the road towards that enduring international peace which all men in these days should be both dreaming of and searching for? There are no doubt still some barbarous races whose introduction to comity and civilization must come through the ministrations of machine guns, but are countries such as Mexico so surely among those races? Has the Christian policy been well tried with them? Have they been fairly and considerately dealt with long enough and consistently enough to prove them insensible to unarmed justice? Have we so dealt with Mexico in the past? Has it always been a case of murderous Mexican and magnanimous American? Is it true that no Mexicans have been killed by Americans on both sides of the Rio Grande lately and during the past century? Did we long ago exhaust all the possibilities of national and individual kindness in dealing with this ungrateful people?

If we can answer these questions affirmatively, it is clearly time for us to try the Roman policy. But are we to fancy that we shall play the Roman game much more fairly or fortunately than the Romans played it? Will the statement "I am a Mexican" be enough to secure in this country such consideration as we insist the statement "I am an American" shall secure in Mexico? Will it content us if our citizens in Mexico enjoy merely such rights and privileges as will be accorded the "greasers" in our border States? In short, will we make the policy one of give and take, one which seeks to exchange rather than to exact respect? If here again we can answer yes, then *we*, apparently, are big enough to play with fire, big enough to transform and sanctify an ideal which has always proved arrogant, selfish, and alienating.

PAUL NIXON.

Brunswick, Me., November 24.

BELGIAN DEPORTATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I was glad to see in the last number of the *Nation* a statement that a mass meeting was to be held in New York to protest against the deportation of Belgians. Your readers, I think, will be interested to know that a mass meeting was held in Tremont Temple in Boston on Tuesday, November 28, some 2,500 people attending. Strong resolutions were passed and forwarded to the President and to the members of Congress from Massachusetts. The telling speeches were loudly applauded, but the loudest and most prolonged applause was reserved for Mr. Storey's statement: "I should be glad to see the President of the United States notify the German Emperor that unless this deportation ceases the Government of the United States will break off diplomatic relations with Germany."

H. LANGFORD WARREN.

Cambridge, Mass., December 10.

INSTRUCTION OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just been shown your issue of October 12, in which you animadvert, on page 335, upon the administration of the National Guard troops on the border and upon the apparent lack of instruction given them by the regulars.

You draw your conclusions from the experience of a small part of the National Guard, and, so far as can be judged from your article, of only a part of that part. Moreover, this part—this is an important fact of which you are probably ignorant—is just the part which is least controlled by the regular army, owing to the requirements of military administration.

The facts are that the New York Division is, geographically, in the Brownsville district, which is commanded by Brig.-Gen. James Parker, United States army, but, owing to the fact that the New York Division commander is a major-general, and therefore of higher military rank than Gen. Parker, this division is excepted from his control and Gen. O'Ryan reports directly to the department commander, Major-Gen. Funston. Gen. Funston does not prescribe the courses of instruction to be given in the various separate commands under him, leaving that to the generals commanding, which any one with any idea of proper military administration knows is the correct procedure.

The course of instruction of the New York Division is entirely in the hands of Major-Gen. O'Ryan, so that the regular officers attached to this division to assist in its instruction are bound by his orders. If the course of instruction prescribed by Major-Gen. O'Ryan had included extended order drills, the Seventy-first New York would have had them, unless its commanding officer disobeyed orders. If it had included a course of rifle-firing, such as the National Guard troops in the adjacent camps were having, the Seventy-first New York would not be as ignorant as they now are, according to your article.

Until September 30, I served in the Brownsville district under Brig.-Gen. Parker and was brigade adjutant of a National Guard brigade during the last two months of that time. *Every National Guard regiment in that district has completed a course in target practice with service ammunition.* Every National Guard regiment in that district has had extended order drills and has had squad, company, battalion, and regimental manœuvres, and by this time should have had brigade manœuvres also.

I have had a number of officers of the National Guard in this district speak to me of the value of the experience which they were having by reason of their service on the border, stating that they were receiving training which it was utterly impossible for them to receive in their State camps and which was of the utmost importance, including castramentation, sanitation, drill, and tactics. That they appreciated the fact that they were having an unusual opportunity was evidenced by the way in which all, from private to colonel, welcomed and asked for instructions and suggestions of all kinds.

Whatever your personal opinions and prejudices, warranted or unwarranted, may be, is it fair, is it good policy, is it good ethics to make sweeping statements without a full

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge of all the facts in the case, so that your readers are, possibly unintentionally but actually, misled and grossly deceived?

WM. A. KENT,
Captain, 4th U. S. Infantry.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma, October 18.

[We believe that we were well within the facts as to the New York troops, and are in receipt of similar allegations in regard to other State troops in other camps.—ED. THE NATION.]

IN JUSTICE TO WACO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your comment on an article by R. P. Brooks, of Athens, Ga., October 6, you say: "Waco, Tex., is the seat of Baylor University. Not a single teacher, or preacher, or newspaper, or public official has spoken out against the mob which publicly burned a convicted negro there."

In this statement you are in error. I am presuming that you would be glad to have the facts.

First, Baylor University. The faculty met and passed resolutions. These were published in the Waco papers. After declaring "that we abhor and deplore the violent acts of the mob," the resolutions go on to "express our disapproval of every form of mob violence," and "solemnly call upon our fellow-citizens henceforth to allow the regular processes of the law to take their normal course in every case that may arise." There was but one feeling, one opinion, and one expression in the faculty, and that was unequivocally against mob law. In the chapel, in the presence of 800 students, I condemned it in as strong words as the English language would permit without violating the ten commandments. In all the expressions as we met privately there was not less of shame than of surprise and indignation. Instead of not a single teacher speaking out, every one spoke out in city schools and university—not in New York to expose something where it would do no good, but in Waco to his neighbor where it would do good. Baylor University stands for law and order. Every ounce of her blood is against mob violence and lynch law among all races, under all circumstances, and everywhere. Every professor and the rank and file of her student body stand together for good citizenship, for the demands, the dignity, and the authority of the law.

Secondly, the preachers. It was a Presbyterian preacher, Rev. E. E. Ingram, who discovered the plot and got the promise of the leader that the law would be allowed to take its course; but the leader was not able to control his crowd. There was sermon after sermon in the chief pulpits of Waco against it. Dr. Caldwell, of the First Presbyterian Church, preached a sermon against it; so did Dr. Culver, of the Austin Street Methodist Church, and Dr. Groner, of the Columbus Street Baptist Church. Pastor Dawson, of the First Baptist Church, made the strongest possible statement against it. The Seventh and James Street Baptist Church adopted resolutions against it, and so did the Baptist Pastors' Conference. Indeed, I know of no church, or preacher, or Sunday-school teacher who did not in all public and private ways roundly condemn it. There was actually danger of making too notorious so black a crime.

Besides this, before this occurrence there had met in the halls of Baylor University the denominational college presidents of the State for the purpose of arousing and organizing the forces of public sentiment against mob violence and lynching, and of starting at the centres of enlightenment a campaign of education for law and order. They issued an address to the people of Texas. This address in the form of resolutions was adopted by the Baptist State Convention, by the Methodist Conferences of the State, and by I do not know how many other religious bodies. Dr. S. P. Brooks, president of Baylor University, and one of the prime movers, had the honor of introducing it in the Baptist State Convention. This I enclose with the privilege of publishing.

Thirdly, the newspapers. These in some cases spoke against this deep disgrace and crime; but, for the most part, it must be acknowledged, they put on the soft pedal, and yet the following, entitled "The Baylor Expression on Mob Law," from the Waco tri-weekly *Tribune*, is not equivocal:

"It had not been the purpose of the *Tribune* to make further editorial reference to the assize of Judge Lynch, held in this city on Monday, May 15. This paper spoke promptly without a moment's delay, in expression of its condemnation, its regret at mob defiance of law and representative public sentiment. But the resolutions sent in to us by the faculty of Baylor University (and appearing on this page) have impelled departure from the purpose that had been formed. That expression speaks for itself and merits the appreciation of the community. It is also a fact to be appreciated that ministers of the gospel have had the conscience and courage to speak in like spirit—Waco ministers. On the bench at San Antonio last week a United States Judge used the Waco episode as a warning to society. All over the land it has evoked like sentiment, and here we leave it—a memory that one does not desire to recall."

For the public officials, I hold no brief; and yet in their apparent indifference and inactivity they are certainly not exceptional in such situations, whether North or South.

The mob element disgraced Waco, it is true, but it did not constitute Waco. Waco has a conscience, but it happens here as it happens elsewhere that the criminal minority takes us unawares; and here as elsewhere there is an irresponsible element that misrepresents the community.

North and South there are those who are working for better laws and better law enforcement. We are learning that we cannot make a good government out of bad people, and that we cannot have a safe government where any considerable number are either ignorant or vicious. Vociferating resolutions and criticisms of one another are too spasmodic, too ragged and weak, to heal the deformities of human society. It will take the training of the schools, a generation of enlightenment in which impulses unrestrained shall be tempered, and passions explosive and misguided shall be steadied and disciplined, before humanity shall rise above animality in crises of extraordinary indignation and excitement. That Waco has shown rare restraint in her just indignation against the mob that disgraced her in its folly and crime is in itself an indication not entirely without hope. At any rate, it is certain that the real Waco with a conscience is not indifferent.

J. L. KESLER,
Dean, Baylor University.

Waco, Tex., October 15.

[We are glad to be corrected and regret our misinformation. But Waco cannot hold up its head until the criminals are punished. —ED. THE NATION.]

Literature

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF POLITICS.

Addresses on Government and Citizenship. By Elihu Root. Edited by Robert Bacon and James Brown Scott. Harvard University Press. $2 net.

Few men of our day are better equipped to discuss the fundamentals of government than Mr. Root. He has had a long and varied experience in public life, as Secretary of War, Secretary of State, United States Senator, arbiter of international controversies at The Hague, as the floor leader of one Constitutional Convention and as the presiding officer of another. During this long term of public service he has reflected carefully upon the problems that came before him, speaking and writing about them freely, surveying them from all the angles that a mind of rare analytical power might suggest. No apology is needed for presenting to American readers the collected addresses of such a man.

The present volume is the second in a series which will, when completed, make six books in all. It comprises forty addresses of varying length, including the lectures on citizenship which Mr. Root gave both at Yale and at Princeton some years ago. Likewise it contains the array of incisive arguments made from the floor of the two New York Constitutional Conventions in 1894 and in 1915, together with various speeches on governmental or legal subjects delivered either in the United States Senate or at the gatherings of bar associations. All these deliverances deal with one great common theme, the spirit and the workings of the American plan of government.

Mr. Root is an individualist by temperament, a believer in democracy of the strictly representative species. He is perturbed at the steadily growing paternalism of American government. Yet he is in no sense a standpatter of the orthodox type. No man of his great mentality and keen powers of observation could let the transformations in our political and social outlook during the past two decades pass by without their inevitable reactions upon his own current of thought. The famous speech on "invisible government" before the Constitutional Convention of 1915, for example, could never have come from the same lips in the Convention of 1894. Yet it would have hit the nail just as squarely on the head in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

days of Conkling or Arthur or Cornell or Platt. His years of public experience, moreover, seem to have brought to Mr. Root a vivid appreciation of two things: the transcendent importance of administrative efficiency in the business of government, and the need of simplifying our governing mechanism. The two go hand in hand. We cannot have the first until we gain the second. Throughout all his political addresses there runs a strain of misgiving that the expanding functions of American government are putting a greater load on the existing administrative machinery than it can safely bear, a tendency to assume that a great democracy must inevitably be more or less incompetent in the regulation of business.

Yet clear vision and sound sense assert themselves whenever it comes to concrete proposals for civic betterment. Mr. Root is never carried away by nostrums and cure-alls; he has no delusions as to the obstacles which must be surmounted in getting political reformations which actually reform; but he retains an abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of democratic institutions no matter what crises they may have to face. His is one of the minds, all too few in our day, that can look ahead without ceasing to cast some glances backward as well. His plea is that the ship of state be navigated as all good ships should be, by heaving the log and taking soundings, not merely by following the cries of the forward-looking man in the crow's-nest. For him, accordingly, there can be no divorce of political idealism from past history and present facts, and there is no nebulous empiricism in his book. The reader who wants solutions for our national problems compressed into tabloids of phrases or formulas and sugar-coated with an easy flow of graceful rhetoric need not look for them here. Mr. Root has addressed himself mainly to lawyers, but at all times to men who are more likely to be influenced by the logic of his arguments, by the orderly exposition of facts, and by appeals to the lessons of history than by all the arts of the sophister. He has clung to the methods of Madison, Hamilton, and Jay; indeed, there is a distinct touch of the Federalist in some of the selections (as, for example, those included in pages 213-244), and to say this is to venture no modest compliment. Several other addresses are not a whit inferior in the cogency of their reasoning. The argument against the recall of judges (pp. 387-410) is a conspicuous example.

No serious student of the American political system can afford to ignore the masterful exposition of its principles which this volume contains. To those who come to it seeking bread will not be given a stone. They will find within its covers the sensible reflections of a man who by his intellectual endowments, his broad sympathies, and his honorable years of public service has amply earned the right to be esteemed a great American.

CURRENT FICTION.

The Van Haavens. By C. Hilton-Turvey. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co.

The rich young man who vindicates his early distaste for the inhumanity of his social background by exchanging it for the friendship of hoboes and falling in love with an ostensible proprietress of a lumberman's hotel in a Canadian wilderness, flouts the Van Haaven family tradition from the start. His sister, the finished product of false standards, who is taught under the mistletoe that even a viscount may be well lost, until she finds she has mistaken the viscount incognito for his untitled companion, flouts caste without cost at the last moment. Both, to the delighted discomfiture of the family, find themselves marrying titles. The genial animus pervading the book seems to rest on the commandment, "Thou shalt not play the snob," to which the upshot of the rather labyrinthine plot adds the gloss, "lest thy victim prove to be listed in Burke's Peerage." Yet why torture the plot for an upshot? The even-tempered book, offering no great challenge to thoughtful reflection, infuses a kindly feeling for its persons, put, though they may be, through too many paces. "The events of life are singularly uncontinuous," says the author. "No one circumstance glides along to a proper ending before the next begins. When it appears to be rounding out to a logical conclusion, along comes another quite unrelated event and shoulders number one out of the way." To test the narrative by this obiter dictum, an ungracious act perhaps, the author conforms either too much or too little, is either too pedestrianly diffusive in incident or too faithful to a predetermined outline. That will be a better tale in which she likes a smaller group more recklessly and lets herself "go."

The Pleasant Ways of St. Médard. By Grace King. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

When Mr. Edward Garnett published his paper on English and American fiction in the *Atlantic*, he roused much discussion, and made some assertions wrong in so many ways that it was hard to know where best to attack him. He did us a service, however, in the high praise he bestowed on "The Pleasant Ways of St. Médard," which he had seen in manuscript; for his praise led to the publication of the book. Whether the story will have, as Mr. Garnett thinks it should, "a permanent place as an American literary classic" may well be doubted; but it is a work of more than ordinary sincerity and charm, and in other ways a good book for the present generation to read. The introduction strikes the keynote with its opening words, "Do you remember?" Nearly all that follows is in the key of reminiscence. Primarily, the story has to do with the fortunes of a fine old New Orleans family, the Talbots, in the evil days following the war; incidentally it gives many vivid pictures of post-bellum New Orleans, especially of the suburban parish of St. Médard, where the Talbots in their new poverty have taken up their abode. There are portraits of Père Philéas, the good priest; of Cribiche, the foundling boy whom he has adopted and whose original sin causes the old man no end of worry; of Doctor Botot, worldly minded but skilful and kindly; of Mademoiselle Mimi Pinseau, who by keeping a small private school maintains in comfort that likable and gouty old roué, her father; and of many others. Best of all, perhaps, are the sketches of Jerry, the old slave, and of the San Antonios; the father, a sordid and dirty old barkeeper, whose shrewdness and unscrupulousness bring him riches in the war period; the mother, his appropriate mate, and the handsome, stupid daughters, educated at the convent, and living with their hired duenna in the beautiful old house that the ex-barkeeper has picked up for a song, while their parents live in the basement. The style is not free from traces of amateurishness; the reminiscence is occasionally a little garrulous, and the diction now and then a bit uncertain. The great merit of the book is its sincerity; its humor and pathos are never made to order, but always spontaneous and genuine. The reader who is not moved by the portrait of old Jerry, or by the chapter entitled The Faithful Warrior, must be well nigh invulnerable to pity.

The Wonderful Year. By William J. Locke. New York: John Lane Co.

The Dark Tower. By Phyllis Bottome. New York: The Century Co.

The Worn Doorstep. By Margaret Sherwood. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

The gallant young Englishman whom the early weeks of the war found at the front is by all odds the favorite of the present fictional season. To which current truth these three volumes bear cheerful witness.

Phyllis Bottome sends a hot-blooded young major to death in the trenches by way of delivering him from a pair of "crocked" lungs and an insoluble amatory problem. What with a naturally refractory temper, the wrong wife, the right girl, and long-enforced exile among Alpine sanatoriums, a mere matter of facing bombs and machine guns came as a welcome relief—heartily to be shared by readers to whom this invalided Hotspur in his chastened phases presents but a mawkish spectacle.

The sentimentality of "The Worn Doorstep" is more refined—quite exquisitely so. An American woman has been betrothed to an Englishman, scholar and gentleman. His enlistment and death leave her alone in England, but so dedicated to its cause that she finds herself a house and home such as they had planned together, and in hospitality to the refugees of the war assuages her grief. To set down the bare outline of a tale like this is ineffably to wrong the author's delicate intention. This includes the lifting of the narrative to a plane of imaginative intercourse on which the bereft lady addresses her dead lover in her diary as she might

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a letter have addressed him living, includes also such distant glimpses of the war as might be seen from rural England and the unmeasured praise of England as the bulwark of European civilization.

Mr. Locke also writes in a vein of international compliment, praising French ways at the expense of English ones. Two rather shabby insular types, an impecunious young schoolmaster and a modern maiden errant of lofty pretensions and inconsiderable attainments, are sent to learn of life, as it can and should be lived, from the provincial French. The perfect gentleman is discovered in the economic rôle of innkeeper and manufacturer of *pâté de foie gras*, the pink of womankind in his housewifely niece. An American sorceress intervenes, gives the little French girl an outing on the Riviera, and leads the young pedant on a wild goose chase to Egypt. But the war and its casualties finally cement the ties of Anglo-French affiliation. Those who cherish a taste for Mr. Locke's decorous blend of wisdom and fantasy will be duly grateful for "The Wonderful Year." Those who prefer robuster fiction will, it is to be hoped, pass it by as a negligible quantity. Certainly there is nothing in it to disturb the predispositions of either class.

BREVOORT'S LETTERS.

Letters of Henry Brevoort to Washington Irving. Together with other unpublished Brevoort Papers. Edited, with an Introduction, by George S. Hellman. 2 vols. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $10.

The appearance in 1915, in a handsome two-volume limited edition, of the letters of Irving to his friend, Henry Brevoort, has now been followed by the publication, in similar style, of the extant letters of Brevoort to Irving. The letters, drawn from the collection of Mr. Grenville Kane, of New York, a grandson of Henry Brevoort, is supplemented by the inclusion, apparently from the same source, of a number of letters to Brevoort, together with a few Irving letters the originals of which were not available when the earlier volumes were issued.

Delightful as are the letters of Irving to his lifelong and most intimate friend, it may be said at once that those of Brevoort do not suffer by comparison. The same vivacity and high spirits, the same skill in gossipy narration, and the same felicity of phrase which characterize the one appear everywhere in the other. Covering, with considerable interruptions, the years from 1811 to 1843, the letters chronicle the literary and personal news of the moment, or touch briefly upon the political events of the time. The first letter, dated January 19, 1811, written while Irving was on a journey to Baltimore and Washington—"I look upon you in the light of an Eastern sovereign travelling through his vast dominions and collecting from his loveing [*sic*] subjects their tributary caresses"—notes, with some misgivings, the appearance of the first number of Walsh's *American Review*, the subscription list of which, however, was said to number as yet only fifty names. A month later comes a racy account of a dinner given by Cooke, the English actor, to some of his company, in which, apparently, most of those present got gloriously drunk and pummelled one another impartially. In May of the same year Brevoort went to Montreal, and thence by canoe to Mackinac, as an associate of John Jacob Astor in the fur trade; and his letters from what was then a wilderness voice, in forcible language, his condemnation of the treatment which the Indians of the region suffered from the American traders, and with which the Government at Washington did not interfere. Irving was known there, however, and his "Knickerbocker's History" was "going the rounds through the village from the commandant to the smallest Indian trader."

In March, 1912, Brevoort went to France, where he was told that Paris at the moment was "extremely dull"; but the "state of absolute beggary and despair" in which English newspapers painted the French peasantry did not accord with his observations. He was indignant, too, at Barlow, the American Minister, who for some reason failed to introduce him to the Emperor and Empress. In December he was in Edinburgh, where he met a number of distinguished people, including Playfair, of whom he writes enthusiastically; but he found neither Jeffrey nor the latest number of the *Review* to his taste. "Its [the *Review's*] tone of flippancy, vivacity, and affected contempt for others, is strikingly characteristic of the genius and conversation of this little inky Hector." He also records that Erskine has in his possession the manuscript of a tragedy, written by Scott "many years ago," which is "distinguished by many marks of his fine genius." Cooke appears again, this time in Kemble's witty comment that the actor's journal "is no better authority than a French bulletin, as it is a fact pretty notorious that he was prone to draw upon his drunken imagination for his sober facts." Journeying back to London, Brevoort met Miss Edgeworth, Madame de Staël, Madame D'Arblay, and others, and reversed his earlier attitude by warmly commending Jeffrey, who was planning a visit to America, to Irving. It would be interesting to know the titles, as well as the present whereabouts, of "some very rare books respecting the early history of New England," which Scott had given him in return for a present of a copy of "Knickerbocker."

From June, 1813, to October, 1818, there is a gap in the correspondence. In the meantime Brevoort had returned to New York, and the letters which follow contain many references to the "Sketch Book" and other of Irving's works, and to Brevoort's faithful services in the business details of publication. The commercial depression of 1819-1821 was keenly felt. "The whole aspect of domestic life has changed since you left us. All the ordinary sources of industry seem to have closed—a great portion of the houses in the city are to let, and their inhabitants obliged to seek a livelihood elsewhere." Nevertheless, he was able to add: "Amidst the general pressure of the times your work augments in popularity." From 1821 to 1827 there is again a gap. Each wrote to the other, but several of the letters failed to arrive, and there is a suggestion of a rupture in the friendship. The catastrophe was happily averted by Brevoort, who on New Year's Day, 1827, in a long letter, defended himself against the imputation of indifference to Irving's interests, and concluded: "Let us then, my dear Irving, begin the new year by a renewal of kind and affectionate recollections and by frank and frequent interchange of our sentiments." It is hardly to Irving's credit that he should, on mere rumor or hasty inference, have allowed himself to doubt the loyalty of the friend to whom, more than to any one else, he owed his literary success and his comfortable income.

At the end of May, 1829, Brevoort communicated the offer of the Secretaryship of Legation at London; tendered to Irving by Van Buren, he adds, without consultation with Jackson, following a suggestion from Irving's friend Nicholson. Irving accepted, and presently, McLane having returned to the United States to become Secretary of the Treasury, was left in charge of the legation. In 1830 Brevoort once more visited Europe, and his letters contain more than the usual number of allusions to the stirring political events of the period. His business affairs, moreover, which for some time had been embarrassing, had improved, and he was able to write in a happier vein. Journeying to Italy, he notes his good fortune "in being preceded everywhere by that ready reckoner, the Marchioness of Connyngham, who established a tariff at the inns very advantageous to my purse." For the success of Rives, the American Minister to France, in achieving a settlement of the long-standing claims of the United States against that country, he has warm praise; unmindful, apparently, that the paramount influence was not Rives, but the "shirt-sleeves" method of Jackson. A capital description of the performances of one Carr, American Consul at Monaco, whom Brevoort met in Paris on his way to that post, is too long to quote, but it may be commended to any one who would know the type of politician whom the American Government long thought fit to select as its representative abroad.

Irving returned to the United States in May, 1832. Brevoort's last letter from Paris (January 18, 1833) was more than usually replete with gossip and reflection. He notes the eagerness with which news about America was just then sought in Europe, and has only kindly humor for Mrs. Trollope's "Domestic Manners of the Americans." "Such writers as Mother Trollope are a real benefit to us. The point of their satire gives their works a circulation amongst readers who would never else have been tempted to bestow a thought upon us, whilst the truth remains and excites an interest to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

know more." Harriet Martineau's "Illustrations of Political Economy" will, he thinks, be "universally read" in the United States. The controversy with South Carolina over nullification, however, filled him with foreboding. "Their patriotism must be strangely diluted to magnify this temporary evil [the tariff] into pretext for rebellion and separation. . . . But the real nature of their disaffection lies deeper to my certain knowledge. They have lost the field of ambition at Washington and they are bent upon creating one of their own. . . . They fear some decisive step will be taken to mitigate the condition of slavery.—But above all they hate us with the rancour of Shylock for our prosperity and impute our gains to their losses. They will be our Ireland without the shadow of the wrongs of that ill-fated country to stimulate them to civil war.—You have no idea of the exultation of the friends of strong government over our impending difficulties on this side of the Water. The disgraceful elopement of one of the sisters of our family they say casts a deep stain upon our house. . . . Johnny Bull is full of brotherly sympathy; he beholds new markets for his wares. The cause of freedom is belied and dishonored."

Until 1842, when Irving was again abroad, the correspondence of the two friends comprises only brief notes of no special importance. Then, with Irving in Spain, Brevoort once more sends him long letters of gossip and information. He was growing old, however, and heavy financial losses, though in part made good from his share in his father's estate, evidently brought gloom. The last letter in the collection (October 18, 1843) compasses both the grave and the gay. "I am no croaker," he writes, "but it grieves me to say, my dear Irving, that this our native land is degenerate and corrupt to the very core. You would not believe the symptoms of rottenness which I could point out and establish, but which are now apparent—political, moral, and social—nor am I able to discover any hope of amendment; any counteracting principles to arrest the downward tendency of all our institutions." Then, with the old vivacity undimmed, he turns to gossip of "old Mr. Astor," who "still holds out"; of "Mr. Delauny, who had been jilted by Sam's Medora," and who avenged himself by selling to his rival the trousseau which had just arrived from Paris; of Van Buren, who has grown very old and "bulbous"; and of "Bancroft, Sparks, Cooper, &c., who are all sighing and dying for the honor of representing the pomp and dignity of our republic at the several Courts of Europe—*for a certain consideration.*"

The letters to Brevoort included in Mr. Hellman's second volume comprise those from Irving, already mentioned, and others from Cooper, Pierre Irving, Chancellor Kent, John Howard Payne, Rembrandt Peale, and others. Some of the criticisms which had to be passed upon Mr. Hellman's editorial work in the previous collection are, happily, unnecessary here, and the narrative introductions which he has contributed are well done. We must still regret, however, the paucity of footnotes, well-nigh indispensable to an understanding of the numerous local and personal allusions, and the lack of an index.

THE STRONG MAN OF SOUTH AFRICA.

General Botha: The Career and the Man. By Harold Spender. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. $2 net.

The first sentence of Mr. Spender's volume recalls an interesting fact not commonly noted, that Louis Botha was born to the citizenship which forty years later he was to reassume under tragic circumstances but with happy results, for he was born in Natal on September 27, 1862, the eighth child in a family of thirteen. Another interesting fact is that the original stock of the Bothas was not Dutch, but French, for there is little doubt that their ancestors were of the Huguenots who fled France after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Louis's parents moved, when he was still a child, into the Orange Free State, financial difficulties being responsible for the migration, and thus "by a mere accident, the Botha family left the British colonies and became citizens of one of the republics, then in the full romance of their earlier development." The second migration, which made Louis a citizen of the Transvaal, came in 1884, when he was twenty-two years of age, and after the death of his father. This was when he joined in the Boer expedition organized by Lukas Meyer to establish the authority over Zululand of Cetewayo's young son, Dinizulu. The assistance thus rendered by the Boers was rewarded by the grant of territory in which was founded the short-lived but interesting "New Republic," finally annexed by consent to the Transvaal in 1888. The expedition had another result, for it led to Botha's marriage with Annie Emmet, the sister of Cheere Emmet, one of the leaders of the adventure and a collateral descendant of the famous Irishman, Robert Emmet. It also gave Botha his first taste of war. The subsequent years were spent by Botha in developing his beautiful farm at Vryheid, unfortunately burnt during the Boer War and never since revisited, and in active participation in local politics, until 1895, when he was returned as a member of the second Transvaal Volksraad. There he joined the liberal group opposed to Kruger and the Old Dutch party whose race prejudice in their treatment of the Outlanders was the proximate cause of the war. When the crisis came Botha was one of seven who cast their votes for peace, although it is notable, and by no means inconsistent, that he was one of those who had favored executing Jameson and the leaders of the famous raid.

The treatment of the Boer War by the English author calls for not a little display of tact. On the whole Mr. Spender has negotiated the difficulties that confronted him with a good deal of skill. The account is necessarily only in outline, but he contrives to bring in all that is essential and he treats the subject without the partisanship of the Imperialist on the one hand, or of the now almost forgotten "pro-Boer" on the other, at the same time emphasizing the creditable and patriotic part played by his subject through the whole sorry business. The chapters on Peace and on Salvage are particularly good, bringing out the patience and sound sense displayed, on the one side, by Botha, and, on the other, by Lord Kitchener. The world at large has perhaps an inadequate appreciation of what services to peace were rendered by the latter, or of what notable diplomatic gifts he combined with his military talents. Towards Lord Milner our author is less tender. Of his energy and his good intentions there is no doubt, but he never understood South Africa or South Africans, whether British or Dutch, and in the end both parties rejected him and his "representative" compromise, the utterly unsatisfactory half measure which he and Mr. Alfred Lyttleton, the Colonial Secretary, had put their heads together to frame. Things were drifting to an *impasse* in South Africa when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman became Prime Minister at the end of 1905.

The grant of responsible government to the Transvaal was only the prelude to the larger step in imperial management which led to the Union of South Africa. Mr. Spender's account of the Convention of South African statesmen which took this matter in hand is clear and compact and brings out the part of prime importance played by Botha, ably assisted by Jameson, the man he had once been anxious to shoot, in conciliating local jealousies and adjusting differences of the utmost intricacy among the various colonies concerned. Jameson's friendship and admiration for Botha at this time was symptomatic of the union of the races which is ever in the foreground of the latter's policies. "Are you aware," said a British extremist to Jameson, "that Botha was one of those men who wanted to shoot you at Pretoria, after the Raid?" "Ah!" replied Jameson, "Botha was always right." A dramatic chapter on The Hertzog Split, which definitely divided the Boer party and came within an ace of unseating Botha, and one on The Labor Crisis, which must be taken as only interrupted and not completed by the coming of war, bring the narrative up to the first part of 1914 and the catastrophe of which the end is not yet. Concluding chapters tell of the rebellion of De Wet and the brilliant little campaign in which Botha crushed it, of the no less brilliant invasion which brought German Southwest Africa under the British flag, and of the vindication of his attitude which Botha received in the elections of November, 1915. The final chapter the author devotes to a sympathetic appreciation of Botha, the Man.

The total impression one receives from this well-organized account is of a strong, forceful personality, whose dominant characteristic is absolute integrity. Having opposed the war policy of Kruger, when war came Botha threw himself heart and soul

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into the struggle. When it became apparent that further resistance was hopeless, he gave himself as whole-heartedly to persuading the "last-ditchers" of his own people that peace was the only means by which the country might be saved. In the negotiations he worked with exceeding energy and not a little astuteness to obtain the most favorable terms possible, and once the treaty was signed, he put the past behind him and strove zealously for its strict observance in letter and in spirit. Now, undoubtedly, his imagination is fired by the vision of a great and united South Africa, free and independent within the family of nations that make up the British Empire. The dream of Rhodes is his also, and it follows that when peace is discussed reckoning must be taken, among other things, of the vision of Louis Botha. "It" (German Southwest Africa), he said on his return from his latest victorious campaign, "is now British Southwest Africa, and it must remain a Province of the Union."

HARVARD ORIENTAL STUDIES.

The Yoga-System of Patañjali, or the Ancient Hindu Doctrine of Concentration of Mind, Embracing the Mnemonic Rules, Called Yoga-Sūtras, of Patañjali and the Comment, Called Yoga-Bhāshya, Attributed to Veda-Vyāsa and the Explanation, Called Tattva-Vāiçāradī, of Vāchaspati-Miçra. Translated from the Original Sanskrit by James Haughton Woods. Harvard University Press.

This (seventeenth) volume of the Harvard Oriental Series is a model of accuracy and skill, in which the various parts indicated by the ponderous title are clearly differentiated by type, and all citations are instantly referable to their respective sources, through an ingenious method of using single and double quotation marks, for which the reader, accustomed to the blind alleys of most Sanskrit texts furnished with commentaries, will be very grateful to the editor.

Professor Woods has here made accessible for the first time to English readers the paraphernalia of explanation which one must carry to get the native exposition of one of the most important Hindu philosophies, of which the Sūtra, or mnemonic rules, give only the outline. An introduction dates the Yoga-Sūtras between A. D. 300 and A. D. 500; the Bhāshya between A. D. 650 and A. D. 850; and the Tattva-vāicāradī *circa* A. D. 850. The identity of the author with the author of the Mahābhāshya is, of course, denied; it is a tradition of the middle ages, but has no foundation in the texts.

An excellent bird's-eye view of the whole work serves as a useful vade-mecum for one journeying through the jungle of this alien thought. In it the whole "system of concentration" appears abridged, and over three hundred pages are reduced to twelve. This is helpful; it shows at a glance that the four books of Sūtras do not enunciate a system of philosophy, but only the means by which one may attain the Yoga-state of concentration, through which the Self (or soul) attains to isolation or self-expression. The whole first book deals with the subject of concentration as a method of resisting "fluctuations" (modes?) of the mind-stuff, by practice and the cultivation of passionlessness through a worldly and a spiritual approach. Thus, devotion to the Içvara leads to concentration; he is the highest Self (the Lord), in whom there is no time-limitation. One should meditate on this Supreme Soul; all obstacles (disease, etc.) are removed by devotion to Him. Or the Yogin may attain perfect mental calmness by exercises in breathing. When thus concentrated, one obtains truthful insight. The second book treats of hindrances and devices for weakening them in the case of a beginner. Nescience, the feeling of personality, passion, aversion, and will to live are the five hindrances. They may be weakened by self-castigation, study, and devotion (to the Supreme Soul). There follows in the third book the discussion of the supernormal powers to be attained, "constraints," which, when exercised, produce intuitive knowledge. Thus the result of "constraint" upon the sun and moon gives rise to an intuitive knowledge of cosmic spaces and the arrangement of stars, respectively. In isolation, the subject of the fourth book, all hindrances subside; all acts of the Self are spontaneous. This follows after the "aspects" (*gunas*) have been resolved into the primary-cause, when the Self is released and the energy of thought is grounded in itself.

Some unusual translations are given by Professor Woods, such as "aspects" for *gunas*, and especially "undifferentiated consciousness" for *avidyā* (nescience). The former we approve, the latter we abhor. *Avidyā* is a kind of thinking, "the reverse of (right) knowledge," such as the recognition of the pure in what is impure or of a self in what is not-self; no one would confuse it with absence of (any) knowledge, and the ordinary use of the word makes Professor Woods's translation impossible in some cases. He has, however, the admirable practice of the native commentators, who always tell in advance what a word to be used is going to mean; so that no harm can come from translating ignorance as "undifferentiated-consciousness," if one prefers.

We have attempted to give to the general reader (of the *Nation*) a rough outline of what the Yoga is. There will, we fear, be few general readers of the book we are reviewing, for "explanations" of "comments" of mnemonic rules of a Hindu cult are not for everybody to enjoy. Yet it were good discipline for anybody to study this volume, whether interested in Yoga or not. Of course, if to understand Hindu philosophy be the aim of any one, the book will be indispensable. We say philosophy advisedly, although not only the abstract given above, but the whole work, might be better designated a manual of mystic psychology. Yet that is the content of Hindu philosophy; it is religious or mystic rather than philosophical. That is why the Yoga, despite the learning and subtlety with which it is presented, loses itself in hallucination and "supernormal powers."

THE FINANCES OF THE WAR.

Financial Chapters of the War. By Alexander Dana Noyes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.25 net.

In the mass of literature that the war has produced, no such analysis as this of financial episodes of a remarkable period has been attempted. Various writers have reviewed different phases of the readjustment caused by the war, and some prophets have ventured predictions as to what the aftermath of the world-conflict would be, both in Europe and in the United States. But no previous writer has attempted "to describe clearly and explain without technicality the remarkable financial and economic episodes which have attended the European war." The task was sufficient, but the author of "Forty Years of American Finance" has made the tale amazingly interesting and available to the reader unversed in the technical details of finance. This book could hardly have come at a more opportune time, since it answers many of the queries which have arisen in consequence of the peace move by Germany and the withdrawal from the American market of the British and French Treasury bills, in deference to the stand taken by the Federal Reserve Board.

Six of the twelve chapters cover the first seventeen months of the period of war. The description of the developments during the first month of the war and the remarkable measures of relief resorted to at London to prevent utter collapse of credit make highly interesting reading. Nearly every prediction as to the specific results of the conflict went astray, and the world now knows how foolish it was to suppose that economic exhaustion would force early abandonment of the struggle. The developments leading up to the closing of the stock exchanges, the problem of moratoria, the hoarded gold, the run on the banks, the forced selling of securities, and the excitement in Germany are described in the chapter dealing with the most formidable panic in history. The emergency expedients adopted by the Bank of England and the British Government—all of them unprecedented in the history of British finance—are discussed with great clearness.

The author has rendered a notable service in making it possible for the average reader to grasp the significance of the break in the foreign exchanges during the first year and a half of war. Instead of indulging in the usual technicalities of an intricate subject, he gives a common-sense explanation of the remarkable developments which must be regarded among the striking phenomena of the period. Similarly the problems arising in connection with the great output of issues of paper money by the belligerent governments are made intelligi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ble to the average reader. The author makes a striking comparison between the paper-money inflation of the European nations and the increase in this country's money supply, rendered possible by our increased stock of gold. A point is made here, which is often overlooked, that the rediscount facilities of our Federal Reserve banks have not been utilized to finance the revival of trade in the United States. After giving all sides of the question, Mr. Noyes takes issue with those critics who see disaster befalling this country after the war is over, when Europe attempts a wicked attack upon our gold supplies. Touching the safeguards provided by our own banking system, Mr. Noyes points out:

Even if London and Paris and Berlin were to bid for our gold in this manner, it would remain to see what response our own money markets would make under the influence of the Federal Reserve Banks, which have large powers through their control over our own money markets to regulate and restrain the movement of our gold. That will possibly be the first occasion when the power of this novel institution in our financial history will be fully tested.

A valuable feature of the book is the excellent index, which makes it possible for the student to control all the topics treated. Although the volume bears the title, "Financial Chapters of the War," it is really a history of the war period. The work grips the reader in a way which causes him to hope that the author will, after the war is over, extend his narrative to take in all the subsequent developments.

Notes

Among this month's publications by the Macmillan Company are "Outline of Applied Sociology," by Henry Pratt Fairchild, and "Public Health Nursing," by Mary S. Gardner.

The following volumes are announced for publication on January 3 by Little, Brown & Company: "The Hillman," by E. Phillips Oppenheim; "The Unwelcome Man," by Waldo Frank, and "The Twenty-four," by the late George Fitch.

For publication early in the new year Henry Holt & Co. announce: "Daybreak" (originally announced as "Victory"), the completion of "Pelle the Conqueror," by Nexo; "The Andes of Southern Peru," by Isaiah Rowman, and "The Girl," by Katherine Keith.

Whoever picks up the two latest volumes in the Art and Craft of Letters series (Doran; 40 cents net each), Barry Pain on "The Short Story," and John Drinkwater on "The Lyric," in the expectation of finding a coherent and well-considered study of these forms of literature, will be disappointed. Barry Pain, who can himself write excellent short stories, merely offers his own reactions to various of the great short-story writers, and ends upon a vindictive note of distaste for the Russians, and a dithyrambic note of praise for Henry James and George Meredith. So far is he from giving an *aperçu* of most of the field that he mentions but one American besides James—Poe—and gives him but three or four condescending words; and he says nothing of the short stories or tales of Scott, Mrs. Gaskell, Anthony Trollope, Stevenson, Gissing, Arnold Bennett, or of a dozen others we might mention. Yet his essay is ostensibly historical rather than anything else, tracing the short story from Marryat to Conrad; and he tells nothing more of the artistic requirements of the form than that it must, from its compression, be richer in suggestion than any other prose! John Drinkwater appears unable to orient himself in his broad field, and is content to smash a few accepted definitions and theories and stop. He vaguely elaborates Coleridge's definition of poetry as "the best words in the best order"; and having exhausted half his space in thus clearing the ground, proceeds to tell us that the familiar statement that a lyric is the expression of personal emotion means nothing, inasmuch as all poetry is this, and to use the rest of his essay in showing the fundamental points of likeness among lyric, epic, dramatic, and narrative poetry, among Shakespeare, Wither, Keats, and Suckling. Much of this is quite sound, and he strikes out several happy epigrams, but at bottom he devotes a paper upon one form of poetry to showing that essential poetry cannot be divided into forms.

Essentially, Mark Van Doren's "Henry David Thoreau" (Houghton Mifflin; $1.25 net) is an amplification of one of the Shelburne essays of Paul E. More. "Thoreau's most discriminating critic," as Mr. Van Doren calls Mr. More, has thrown into relief the resemblances between Thoreau and the German romanticists, and in this little book the chief point of resemblance—the doctrine of expansion—has been made central in the interpretation of Thoreau. An important part of Mr. More's view has, unfortunately, been lopped off; the view that Nature was, for Thoreau, a "discipline of the will," and not only a stimulation to the imagination, has been modified nearly to annihilation. One may well question, however, the validity of the assumption that Arnold's three-fourths of life was a cipher in the case of Thoreau. To Mr. Van Doren, Thoreau is in the main "an expansive bore," with a saving "genius for the specific." His error was that he deliberately inhabited a vacuum, and not the "great and common world" of Plato and Shakespeare—this is true enough, though happily there were compensations which Mr. Van Doren makes too little of. For solid, demolishing criticism of Thoreau, one will look in vain for anything more effective than the present volume; Lowell's spirited attack is, by comparison, weak and superficial. Yet in the end one cannot help wondering why Thoreau should have so impressive a following, why, for example, the American public may be counted on to include "Walden" in such lists as the recent "hundred most popular books" selected from Everyman's Library, if he is not more deserving of esteem than Mr. Van Doren conceives him. Outspoken praise he reserves for the last three or four pages of his book, and then he is scarcely satisfactory. Few writers have been more foolishly praised than Thoreau, and we are naturally grateful for a sober and philosophical critical study of him, but this study is not what it might have been, a sympathetic, discriminating, well-rounded interpretation. The little that is said of Thoreau's relation to Nature, for one thing, is quite inadequate. "Thoreau's idea of the friendly relation demanded complete sympathy and toleration from the second party." This, says Mr. Van Doren, he failed to find in his friends, and *therefore* he sought the friendship of Nature. The simplicity of this conception surely has something of the Transcendental naïveté.

We have received the October-December issue of the *Bulletin* of the John Rylands Library (Manchester), a quarterly sold for the trifling sum of sixpence. Recent numbers have contained studies of such recondite subjects as the origin of the cult of Dionysos and Kurânic manuscripts. The present number, however, is enlivened by a paper of very general interest. Prof. T. F. Tout, of the University of Manchester, writes engagingly of "A Mediæval Burglary." It is true that he did not set out to make an investigation of this unusual subject, but we are nevertheless thankful that the details of the incident were encountered while he was seeking for light on the technicalities of the history of the King's Wardrobe. This historical burglary of the royal treasury took place in the year 1303, within the sacred precincts of Westminster Abbey, and the story is well worth the telling, especially by so facile a pen. Professor Tout finds occasion to speak briefly of the finances of England during the reign of Edward I. The King was at war, as now Kings are at war, and imposed taxes which would to-day astound even the most violent militarist. The clergy, who were not expected to fight, bore the heaviest rate of taxation; and it is said that the Dean of St. Paul's fell dead on the spot when he learned of the unprecedented impost—the equivalent of an income tax of ten shillings in the pound. (In these days of much talk about military preparedness, a profitable lesson can be drawn from the poor dean's unhappy fate!) The *Bulletin* contains much bibliographical matter, including the third list of books collected by the John Rylands Library as a contribution to the new library of the University of Louvain.

"Railway Regulation," by I. L. Sharfman, is one of a series of texts prepared for a course in business administration conducted by the La Salle Extension University (Chicago). Neither in subject matter nor in method of treatment does it reveal any originality. It relies to a considerable degree upon material already published, from which it freely quotes, and its point of view is the one generally accepted by students of the subject. Its brevity necessitates summary treatment of the many topics introduced, and hence renders it unsatisfactory for any one who desires to study exhaustively any phase of railway regulation. Yet, for the reader who desires an outline of the history and problems of railway control in the United States, this book may be commended as a well-arranged, well-balanced, and well-written handbook on the subject.

When Archdeacon Cunningham was in this country in the autumn of 1914 he delivered half a dozen lectures on a variety of subjects—townships, architecture, colleges, the function of the state in modern society. Through all the lectures, however, ran a common thread by which the distinguished economic historian of England sought to show some of the ties which have connected America with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her Anglo-Saxon mother. Those who heard him will be glad that his lectures have been gathered together in a volume with the appropriate title, "English Influence on the United States" (Putnam; $1.25). He traces, for instance, the rectangular arrangement of American city streets as at Philadelphia to the reforming influence of Christopher Wren in London after the Great Fire of 1666 and the use of a dome, as at the State House at Annapolis or Boston, through St. Paul's Cathedral in London to St. Sophia at Constantinople. Notable, though not novel, is his discussion of the strong influence of the Scotch universities upon American colleges in general and Princeton in particular.

The seventeenth volume of the Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts contains the usual variety of valuable contributions by its members, including four communications from its editor, Albert Matthews, which occupy no less than 250 of the 409 pages. The longest of these articles contains notes on the Massachusetts Royal Commissions, and is, therefore, a supplement to the second volume of the Society's publications in which the Commissions are printed. The next in length, that on "The Pilgrim Fathers," was noticed in the *Nation* when it appeared last year as a separate issue. Other contributions are "The First Official Frontier of Massachusetts," by Professor Turner, of Harvard, and a "Continuation of the Diary of George Washington," covering two of Washington's years of retirement at Mt. Vernon, 1785-1786. Distinctly the most human document in the volume is the communication by Andrew McFarland Davis on the "Editorship of the Massachusetts Province Laws," in which are set forth some of the difficulties that confront the scholar who is compelled to work under legislative supervision. The peculiarities of the late editor of the laws, Abner C. Goodell, did much to injure the cause of official publication, by the State of Massachusetts, of its historical records, and we fear that further issue of these records, particularly of the proceedings of the Assembly and the Council, is likely to be indefinitely postponed, a fact much to be regretted by historical scholars.

In 1894 the late William Nelson began, but unfortunately never completed, his "History of American Newspapers" (printed in *New Jersey Archives*, Vols. XI, XII, XIX). In 1907 the Colonial Society of Massachusetts published a "Check-List of Boston Newspapers, 1704-1780." In 1910 the Illinois State Historical Society published "Newspapers and Periodicals of Illinois, 1814-1879." And in 1913 the American Antiquarian Society began to publish, but has not yet completed, a "Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820." These are no doubt the most elaborate check-lists of newspapers ever attempted in this country, since in each the collections of many libraries are listed; but, owing to the labor and expense involved, it is not likely that many other societies will print similar lists. In 1898, however, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin published a check-list of newspapers found in its own library only, a second edition appearing in 1911; and this laudable example was followed by the Library of Congress in 1901 and 1912, by the Department of Archives and History of the State of Alabama in 1904, by the New York Public Library in 1915, and now by the Yale University Library—"A List of Newspapers in the Yale University Library." Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, Vol. II (Yale University Press; $3).

After an interval of thirty years, a new edition, "substantially unchanged," has appeared of Miss Isabel Florence Hapgood's "Epic Songs of Russia," with an appreciative introductory note by Prof. J. W. Mackail (Scribner, $1.50 net). This volume has won just praise as the only collection in English of the Russian *byliny*. Of these it contains forty, in readable English prose translations, thus giving a sufficient notion of the content of this interesting branch of popular literature. The method throughout is dilettante, not critical; no exact indications are given of the sources of the texts, and the introduction and appendix will by no means satisfy serious students of folk-lore.

The first volume of a series on the religious life of India offered by the Oxford Press is "The Village Gods of South India," by the Right Rev. Henry Whitehead, Bishop of Madras. The new series has all the advantages of scope and compass; a study of the various cults of Hinduism and Mahommedanism in small, convenient volumes. Not the least interesting phenomenon is that where Hindus and Mohammedans have for so long been contiguous they have adopted and assimilated from each other. Thus the diversity of cult and practice to be found in India's great religions has ever baffled students, while the degree to which so many of the leading cults of Hinduism have degenerated has long been a matter of concern to the more progressive adherents of that faith, and has inspired the formation of reform societies.

The subject of Bishop Whitehead's study is not only a popular but a necessary one in the series. The amazing variety of ritual and ceremonial that is practiced under the all-absorbing Hinduism must continue to engross students, for its full history will not be available for years to come, until ethnologists have delved more deeply into the welter of tribes and races, large and small, that have managed to preserve vestiges of atavistic resemblance in physiognomy and custom wherever they happen to have found their ultimate settlement. And chief among these is the original Dravidian stock, whose animistic cults persist to-day under the religion of the conquering Aryan, even to the extent of largely influencing and moulding it. It is in the south of India, where the Dravidian and other primitive races were driven by the successive invaders, that the true history of India, ethnological and religious, remains to be uncovered. The rare surviving data are epigraphic and of uncertain provenance, so that it is through the more or less integral religious life and custom of the various races that a coherent beginning is to be made. Bishop Whitehead's see embraces this historic region of the ancient kingdoms of the south, and his suggestive chapters on Tamil, Telugu, and Canarese modes of worship hint at the existence of a wealth of material. This little book also contains some interesting illustrations of shrines typical of the improvisation peculiar to all these cults. A Glossary of Indian terms, a list of gods, male and female, and a geographical index to the ethnological divisions, all provided with diacritical marks, promise well for the series.

The issues of the American Bible Society in Bibles and New Testaments began in its first year, 1816-17, at 6,410, and in its ninety-ninth year, 1914-15, stood at 6,406,323. The increase has been rapid in the last ten years; in the last three of its century, an advance of a million annually. War, it seems, stimulates the output. With our Civil War, the issues leaped for the first time into the million, and almost into the second; in fact, the level at the close of that war was not reached again for twenty years. The output of complete Bibles, though fluctuating sharply, has since 1878 remained usually below 400,000, so that the issue is, in its increase, becoming more and more preponderantly an issue of testaments and "portions" alone. One reason for this is probably to be found in the growing list of translations. The languages and dialects represented now number 164, not including issues for the blind; and translation, naturally, begins with one or more of the Gospels. The text published in English has been the King James version of 1611, and its revisions in 1881, 1885, and 1901. Other texts, which are required to conform to these British and American versions "in the principle of their translation," have, with some early exceptions, been made out of the original tongues. In the Society's "Centennial History" (Macmillan; 2 vols.; $2), Dr. H. O. Dwight naturally does not tarry over question of sources. It may be noted that, following a considerable use of the Scio (Spanish) version, the policy finally adopted in 1841 of excluding the Vulgate (now in course of rescension under Gasquet), and its derivatives and the earlier decision in 1827, following that of the British society, to narrow Reformation canons by expunging the apocrypha outright, have combined with the Roman Catholic policy, when maintained, of discouraging lay reading to restrict, probably for all time, the amazing vigor of a splendid enterprise to the service of the Protestant churches. Field work is said to stimulate from time to time an answering Roman activity, as in the French Testament of 1872, the Japanese Gospels, 1898, and more recently the issue of portions of the New Testament in Brazil.

If it has not been possible to serve all Christendom, the work has been world-wide, the Society has stood in the front rank of the many national societies of its kind, and within the bodies which Dr. Dwight calls the "Evangelical Church" its progress has, with one exception, been unhampered by any sectarian difficulties. The dispute which arose in 1836 over the translation of the Greek word *βαπτίξω* led to the founding of the American and Foreign Bible Society, a separate Baptist organization. Bearing in mind the prodigious mass of detail which Dr. Dwight has had to marshal into statement, it may seem unappreciative to cavil at the character of the resulting record. No objection can be taken to the author's pervasive interest in making the account "edifying," in the apostolic sense of the word. The historian is frankly not a lay historian. The defect is rather that he has chosen to present his hundred years, not in a history, but in annals. The mere repetition that results brings some of the development to light, as, for instance, the first growth out of local auxiliary societies, the progress to growth by auxiliaries, the shifting of vitality into the district superin-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tendents, and, finally, the complete breakdown of the auxiliary system, and the almost complete centralization of the work of distribution. But clarifying generalization is lacking for the most part, and the "general reader" for whom the book is intended, though led through many an interesting incident and biographic glimpse, will, if he manages to read the record through, be all too likely to carry away an undeservedly blurred impression of the Society's experience and achievement.

Drama

MAXINE ELLIOTT'S THEATRE.

Miss Gertrude Kingston, who has attracted enthusiastic audiences to the Neighborhood Playhouse, is now giving, in a short engagement at Maxine Elliott's Theatre, a programme of three one-act plays, which together make up a pleasant entertainment. The first, "The Inca of Perusalem," by "A Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature"—undoubtedly G. B. S.—is best characterized by a line in the dialogue: "What is more wonderful than talk?" It is indeed a talky, if amusing, sketch. As the Inca is no other than the Kaiser, bent upon marrying off one of his sons to a princess, and as the princess's place is usurped for the nonce by an English lady posing as the former's maid, the whole international situation is up for discussion. The thing is the frothiest trifle, but for the most part is highly diverting. The rollicking fancy of the piece may be indicated by a single detail. One of the Inca's sons is named Jack Johnson. Who but a child, or Mr. Shaw, would have hit upon this?

The other play by Shaw, this time openly his, is "Great Catherine," which, of course, deals with the whims and foibles of the great Russian monarch. Of plot there is next to nothing. A captain of the English army comes on important business to the Empress (Miss Kingston), but before gaining an audience has a set-to with the drunken Prime Minister (admirably done by Walter Ringham, the excellent Inca of the former piece). The upshot is that the Prime Minister as a jest carries him bodily into the Empress's bed-chamber. When this handsome Englishman, embarrassed by the monarch's attentions, attempts to flee the city, he is of course lugged back, and now securely bound is placed at the foot of her chair, where she sends him into hysterics by applying the point of her toe to his ribs, this procedure being interspersed by much bright dialogue. The climax, which is of the penny-whistle variety, is yet sufficient for the occasion.

The other performance, "The Queen's Enemies," by Lord Dunsany, is purely spectacular—at least it is as given by this company. It is a question, however, whether the author did not make allowance for more finesse than that displayed by Miss Cathleen Nesbitt in her portrayal of an Egyptian Queen, who, because she is so distressed by the thought of having enemies, lures these neighboring monarchs to a banquet in an underground temple and, having escaped herself, allows the Nile to flow in upon them and drown them. As here interpreted, the audience is impatient for the climax; the insinuating graces exhibited by the Queen to still the fears of the enemies are not magnetic enough to make any one—let alone an enemy—lose one's head. F.

"LITTLE LADY IN BLUE."

Two things only make this latest production at the Belasco Theatre worthy of serious consideration: the manner of its presentation, which reveals Mr. Belasco at his best, and a piece of supremely good character work by George Giddens, in a broadly humorous part of a sailor man, altogether as well-rounded a bit of comedy as has been seen in New York in many seasons. The play itself, which is by Horace Hodges and T. Wigney Percyval, is of thinner stuff than was the "Grumpy" of those authors, and lacks the human appeal of the central character in that piece. Frankly artificial in theme, one suspects that it was produced because the moment seemed ripe for a costume play. In this respect Mr. Belasco's intuition was probably correct, but the appeal to the eye requires at least to be reinforced by some sort of appeal to the intelligence, and this is conspicuously lacking in "Little Lady in Blue." The story may be dismissed in a few words: Anne Churchill, a needy but charming English governess, comes by chance into possession of the details of an elderly Admiral's will. His fortune is left to a profligate nephew, on the secret condition that by a certain date, six months after the Admiral's decease, he shall have reformed, paid his debts, and been reinstated in His Majesty's navy. Anne promptly sets herself to the task of reformation, with the idea of marrying him and his uncle's money. The happy ending is obvious. The plot is unconvincing, and the handling of it does not make it less so. The play, however, is well acted throughout, and beautifully staged. Miss Frances Starr is a pretty and winsome Anne, despite some affectations of voice and manner which creep in to mar her performance. S. W.

"The Hate Breeders," described as a drama in one act and five scenes, by Ednah Aiken (Bobbs-Merrill; 75 cents net), is a vigorous bit of work, in which the horrors of war are set forth with vivid imagination and unflinching realism. Actually, it is a panorama, with dramatic episodes, rather than a play. The familiar arguments against militarism have seldom been grouped more tersely or effectively, but the demonstration of an evil is one thing and the abolition of it, unfortunately, is another. To say that there would be no wars, if men everywhere, discerning in the ideal of universal brotherhood something higher and nobler than the narrower claims of national patriotism, would refuse to fight, is an obvious truism. The problem, to which no solution has yet been found, is how this is to be brought about. The dramatist does not offer much aid in this direction. Her hero, Max Dohrman, a young German Socialist, an ardent and enlightened philanthropist, exhorts his associates, when war is declared against France, to refuse to join the colors; to suffer death as traitors rather than obey the orders of kings, munition makers, and politicians. Their martyrdom, he says, would kindle a fire of sympathetic zeal that, in the end, would insure general and perpetual peace. He is ready to die for his faith, but finally, deserted by his friends and sweetheart, is swept away by the flood of what he has denounced as slavish enthusiasm, and marches to the field, where he learns to kill and ravish, until he is driven mad by the pain of his wounds and the terrors of conscience. The last glimpse of him is on an operating table, raving, in his bonds, against the ministrations of surgeons and nurses who would make him fit again for the battle line. As an effort of realistic imagination, wholly devoid of mere sentimentality, the sketch is a praiseworthy achievement.

Percival Wilde, the author of "Dawn" and other one-act plays, now publishes a second collection (Holt; $1.20 net) under the title "Confessional." Like the first lot, they exhibit inventive ingenuity and a quick sense of theatrical effect. All of them would act well, or, in other words, are shaped well for actual representation, but all of them are too tricky and insincere to have much real dramatic value. In almost every instance the climactic situation, for which the piece was devised, has the desired element of surprise or shock, but is reached by the sacrifice of almost every artistic consideration. Good ideas are wasted because the realities and probabilities of life are ignored. The scheme of "Confessional," for instance, is excellent in its main outlines, but becomes incredible in the telling. It is conceivable, of course, that an ordinarily honest but weak man might be tempted to commit a dishonorable action by a vast bribe and the certainty of immunity, but here is a man of lifelong and rigid integrity, who has instantly and scornfully refused, at any price, to keep silence, even to save a man whom he had always respected—when he could do it without peril to himself—who, in a moment, abandons all his principles, when his wife, who has always revered him for his incorruptibility, expresses the opinion that he ought to take the easy money for the sake of his family. The whole proposition, as Mr. Wilde states it, is flagrantly and, for dramatic purposes, foolishly improbable. The climax is reached when, by a full confession of the criminal, the hero reaps a reward made inexpressibly bitter to him by the conviction of his own moral catastrophe. Had the preliminaries been in any way consistent or reasonable, this ironical stroke of fortune would have been true and poignant. As it is, a capital design is spoiled by amateurish execution.

There is much more plausibility in "The Villain in the Piece," and it contains good theatrical matter. A millionaire wins a bride from his clerk, who had been her accepted lover, not because he is richer, but because he proves that his passion to possess her was stronger than his sense of fair play. He is not a villain at all, in the common meaning of the word, but simply selfish and masterful. There is freshness in the details, and the girl is drawn with much veracity, but the men are conventional. "According to Darwin" is prudently prefaced by a disclaimer of any intent to assail organized charity. It is a bit of crude and sordid realism, with some vivid characterization, but is wholly unjust in its implications and suggests a strange ignorance of the subjects with which it professes to deal. A satirist ought to be sure of his facts. "A Question of Morality" is a smartly written quibble in which there is no question of morality at all, or any atom of significance. In "The Beautiful Story," which is prettily written and is intended to illustrate the danger of completely destroying a child's capacity for faith in serious matters by imposing on its credulity in the matter of fairy tales whose falsity must sooner or later become apparent, there is an argument of substantial weight,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but the validity of the demonstration is extremely questionable. Here is another instance in which Mr. Wilde sees nothing but his theatrical point. To intimate that a child, enlightened as to Santa Claus, is likely to become atheistic is to be ridiculous.

"Master Will of Stratford" (Macmillan; 50 cents), a midwinter night's dream, by Louise Ayres Garnett, is somewhat light in substance for prologue, three acts, and epilogue, but exhibits ingenuity and humor. In this Shakespeare, a boy of twelve years, after a busy day, in which he has had an exciting encounter with Sir Thomas Lucy and Queen Elizabeth, an adventure with a peddler, and a visit from his little friend Betsy and her baby brother, goes to bed and dreams the play, in which witches, fairies, and humans are mingled fantastically together. The baby of the daytime becomes the Indian boy that caused the trouble between Oberon and Titania; the peddler is translated into a lively parody of Autolycus, while Sir Thomas Lucy is made to figure as Bottom the Weaver, to the infinite amusement of Queen Elizabeth and the compassionate adoration of Titania. Incidentally, he becomes the prototype also of Jack Falstaff at the oak of Herne the Hunter. The whole thing is in the nature of a fairy pantomime, and does not challenge serious criticism, but the dialogue is brightly written and the entire scheme by which the waking and sleeping fancies of the boy Shakespeare are predicated upon the actual products of his maturity is worked out with much natural cleverness, if without much regard to theatrical difficulties. Will really is the sort of boy that Shakespeare might have been, and it is plain that the author has read him with sympathetic intelligence. As for the atmosphere and language, they are to the full as Elizabethan in kind and quality as those of Messrs. Burrill and Bennett.

Music

AN OPERATIC FRANCESCA DA RIMINI.

O. G. Sonneck, who has charge of the musical department in the Library of Congress, in his volume of essays on music, "Suum Cuique," just published by G. Schirmer, discusses the "New Uplift in Italy's Musical Life." The almost exclusive devotion of the Italians to the opera has been chiefly responsible for the degradation that called for a "new uplift." The Catalogo generale of the mammoth publishing house of G. Ricordi included, in the year 1900, 320 composers of operas, with 1,165 works, and only 24 composers of string quartets, with 47 works. Nearly all of the operas are as ephemeral as newspapers. "We really do not know," writes the famous Italian critic, G. Ferrero, "whether we ought to believe in an artistic future for this nation, once so abounding in men of genius." The hopes based on Mascagni and Leoncavallo have proved futile. Their complete works, so far as the public is concerned, now constitute the double-bill, "Cavalleria Rusticana" and "I Pagliacci," and even this combination depends for its audience largely on a cast including Caruso. Puccini has done much better; but even he ceased being a genius after he had composed "Madama Butterfly."

Among the younger men the most prominent are Giordano, Montemezzi, and Zandonai; but none of these has as yet produced a masterwork or one giving promise of a successor to Verdi and Puccini. The latest to find a place in the big Ricordi catalogue is Riccardo Zandonai, whose "Conchita" was sung in 1913 in Chicago and New York; it is interesting chiefly because of its Spanish coloring. An earlier work by the same composer, "The Cricket on the Hearth," was staged at Turin in 1908, while its successor, "Francesca da Rimini," was first heard in 1914, also in Turin. After being produced in London, with considerable success, it was selected by Mr. Gatti-Casazza as the principal novelty of the season at the Metropolitan Opera House, where it was produced last Friday. There was a large audience to hear it and a great deal of applause, led by a vigorous claque, after each act; but it is doubtful if the opera will prove a more lasting success than any of the other new Italian operas produced by the present manager. It is fascinating in spots, but there is no trace of the melodic genius which made Italy famous.

The story of the guilty love and sad fate of Francesca and Paolo is most widely known through Dante's allusion to it. Gabriele d'Annunzio expanded it into a tragedy, which was heard in this country some years ago with Mme. Duse as the heroine. Tito Riccordi made a libretto of it by simply condensing the play, and the opera book prepared by the publishers for London and New York is, fortunately, not the usual hackwork, but follows Arthur Symons's excellent translation. As expanded by d'Annunzio, the story set to music by Zandonai shows in the first act how Francesca is snared into a political marriage with the deformed Giovanni Malatesta under the delusion that her bridegroom is to be Giovanni's handsome younger brother, Paolo, whom she has seen but once, long enough, in the impulse of love at first sight, to give him a rose, but without exchanging a word. In the second act the stage presents a realistic picture of mediæval warfare between the Guelphs and the Ghibellines. Francesca follows Paolo, and when he is seemingly injured by a shaft passing through his hair, the touch of her hand fans the flame of his love to fierce passion. He is appointed Captain of the Commune of Florence, but the longing to be with Francesca brings him back soon. Alone in her apartment they read together about love in the story of Launcelot and Guinivere, and their lips meet. There is a third brother, who has also made love to Francesca. Spurned by her, he turns spy and tells Giovanni of their secret meetings. In the last scene the husband surprises them, and both are pierced by his sword.

For operatic purposes this is a good plot, and so far as the orchestral score is concerned, Zandonai has made good use of his opportunities, especially in the war music of the second act, which, to be sure, is modern (without being ultra modern), while the warfare itself is mediæval, with flying arrows and stones and molten lead poured down on the enemy instead of guns. In the interspersed idyllic scenes, however, the music also has a mediæval coloring, imparted to the score by the use of obsolete instruments like the lute, the viola pomposa, the piffero (a small oboe used by Italian mountaineers), besides the old Roman buccina in the turbulent scenes. The effect is charming, making one wonder why Richard Strauss and other seekers of local color do not make more frequent use of such devices.

In the love scenes, unfortunately, Zandonai is much less satisfactory. Here the voice must dominate over the orchestra, and for voice this composer does not write as interestingly as for the instruments. The old Italian style has indeed been topsy-turvied! There are no striking melodies for the singers to ingratiate themselves with the public; and without striking melodies no opera can win lasting success. It used to be said that Wagner, in his later operas, provided no melodies for the singers; but dramatic *bel canto* artists like Lehmann, Nordica, Jean de Reszke exposed the error of that notion. With artists of their rank Zandonai's opera might live some years. As sung by Mme. Alda, Martinelli, and Amato it gives pleasure—in spots—but without promise of a future. The orchestral score, which is as difficult as it is praiseworthy, was interpreted by Giorgio Polacco in masterful style.

HENRY T. FINCK.

Art

THE COMPLETION OF A GREAT WORK.

A History of Architecture. Vols. I and II by Russell Sturgis. Vols. III and IV by A. L. Frothingham. Vol. III: Gothic in Italy, France, and Northern Europe. Vol. IV: Gothic in Great Britain—Renaissance—Modern Architecture. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. $5 each.

I.

The important "History of Architecture" begun by the late Russell Sturgis, of which the first two volumes appeared in 1907 and 1910, respectively, has lately been completed by Prof. A. L. Frothingham, of Princeton, in two additional volumes from the publishing house of Doubleday, Page & Co., who took over the enterprise from the Baker & Taylor Company after Mr. Sturgis's death. Professor Frothingham is to be congratulated upon the distinguished success with which he has discharged his responsible and delicate task. The original intention was to complete the work in three volumes, for the last of which, however, Mr. Sturgis had prepared little or no material. It was felt by many that, owing to the discursive amplitude of treatment of the matter covered by the first two volumes, a complete change of plan and method would be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary if all the remaining periods and styles were to be compressed into a single volume, and that this would be to sacrifice many of the merits and advantages signalized in the two that had been published. Professor Frothingham evidently shared this feeling, and the delicacy of his task lay in the necessity of choosing between such a sacrifice on the one hand and a change of plan on the other. He wisely decided in favor of the latter course, and expanded the proposed volume into two. In the matter of method, however, he resolved to subordinate his own preference for a more historical treatment of the subject to the more analytical method of the first two volumes. He has thus preserved a general unity of treatment throughout the four volumes at the cost of a sacrifice which many will regret, while commending the author's self-denial.

The second volume brought the history of architecture down to the close of the Romanesque period. The new volumes carry that history through the Middle Ages and Renaissance and the modern developments. Volume III treats of the Gothic styles exclusive of Great Britain. Volume IV devotes 88 pages to the British Gothic, 230 to the Renaissance, and 13 to modern architecture. In all we have 490 pages assigned to the Gothic styles, less than half that space to the Renaissance, and only 13 pages to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. If the author could not spare the space for a more adequate treatment of this last period, it would have been better to omit these scanty pages. To the architect, at least, there is in the work of these two centuries and in the modern movements much that is of profound interest and value. But to the archæologist, to the non-professional student, especially to one who has, like Mr. Frothingham, devoted almost a lifetime to the study of the art of the Middle Ages, this work makes a less cogent appeal. In Volume IV our own Colonial architecture and the interesting Greek revival which followed it, are not even mentioned. The proportioning of space in these volumes evidently represents the relative degrees of the author's personal interest in the styles he describes rather than an ideal distribution. The preponderance of space devoted to the Gothic styles is perhaps defensible; and yet how can one justify the omission of even passing reference to such Renaissance monuments as the superb Library of St. Mark at Venice and the palaces of the Louvre and Tuileries and Versailles in France, or to the works of James Gibbs and Somerset House in England, with a mere slurring allusion to the London Houses of Parliament? Such omissions are the more noticeable because of the considerable space, relatively, devoted to works of the earlier Renaissance of much less intrinsic importance. The author is plainly much more interested in the picturesque, formative phases of the Renaissance than in the more formal, stately, and monumental architecture of its later development: he has no sympathy with the cold "grand manner" of the age of Louis XIV. He reveals himself as fundamentally a Gothicist in his predilections; not, indeed, a Gothic fanatic, by any means, for he nowhere indulges in those hostile and sweeping condemnations of Renaissance design which vitiate the writings of more than one of the English and American critics. But his appreciations of Renaissance works are sympathetic in proportion as these display qualities which ally them in a measure with Gothic design. It is instructive to compare his treatment of the French Renaissance with that, for instance, in the writings of W. H. Ward and Reginald Blomfield.

II.

Having made these reservations, one may turn with almost unmixed satisfaction the 490 pages which deal with the Gothic styles. The Introduction to Volume III (pp. xxvii to xxxii) deserves to be read by every student of architecture. Book X, with which the volume opens, treats of the rise and evolution of "Gothic" in France. (Why will writers persist in using the adjective as a noun without the article in this barbarous fashion?) Its six chapters discuss the origins of the style; its development; figured sculpture and stained glass; local schools and "later Gothic"; civil, military, and monastic Gothic; and the development of architectural detail. Book XI discusses the Gothic styles of southern Europe, in three chapters devoted to Spain, Portugal, and Italy; the three chapters of Book XII deal with northern Europe—Germany, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Switzerland, and Russia. The two chapters on the rise and development of the French Gothic styles are in every way admirable: plan, structure, membering, and historical development are all adequately and clearly set forth, gathering together what is best and most essential from the works of Viollet-le-Duc, Choisy, and Moore, and shaping this and other material in the light of the author's own studies and investigations. Capter vi is also worthy of special commendation; and, indeed, Book X as a whole merits very high praise. Spain and Portugal, in Book XI, receive more attention and illustration than has been customary in English and American works, and for this we should be grateful. To the Gothic architecture of Italy fifty-five pages are assigned, and it is none too many. The author is a recognized authority on the Cistercian beginnings of the style in Italy, and his admiration for the French structural logic does not blind him to the splendor, however illogical from the structural standpoint, of the Italian monuments. Very satisfactory also is his presentation of the German Gothic style, with abundant illustration of monuments too seldom discussed in other than German histories.

The English Gothic styles occupy the first book (Book XIII) of the fourth volume. To those who have long resented Professor Moore's unsympathetic and depreciatory treatment of this splendid phase of Gothic architecture, Professor Frothingham's handling of the subject will make a most welcome appeal. In the opening paragraph of this volume the author declares that England "is a splendid second to France in the race for honor"; that she "made an independent application of Gothic principles and developed its artistic forms under different norms"; and "contributed original elements to the common stock." Dissenting from Moore's contention that English multiple-ribbed vaulting was a violation of true Gothic principles, he recognizes it as a distinct national contribution to the Gothic system. As in most of the discussions, both in this and in the other volumes of the work, the treatment is rather analytical than historical. But a consecutive historical treatment is peculiarly difficult with the English monuments, each of which exhibits work of several periods. Especially commendable is the devotion of a section to the English chapter-houses, the most distinctive contribution of England to Gothic structural design. One might wish fuller accounts of the "open-timber" roofs, of the parish churches, and of towers and spires. But where so much is excellent, it would be invidious to dwell heavily on such minor deficiencies.

In the discussion of Gothic architecture in general in these volumes one notes a praiseworthy breadth of view, a general sanity of critical estimates, and the accuracy of trained scholarship. The treatment of vaulting and of buttressing might have been more detailed; so far as it goes it is sound. Mr. Frothingham distinguishes the Gothic style from all others as the one preëminently dynamic style, and insists frequently but not too dogmatically on its logic. He repeats what a strict scientist must consider the common error of designating the Gothic system as one of "balanced" thrusts, and refers repeatedly to the "opposed thrust" of the flying buttresses. Some of the thrusts are, indeed, balanced by opposed thrusts; but the function of the flying arch is to *transmit* the vault-thrust to the dead resistance of the external buttress. Its own counter-thrust is almost negligible.

III.

Turning now from the portions of Professor Frothingham's work which deal with the Gothic styles to the chapters on the Renaissance, which occupy most of Volume IV, we recognize many of the same merits that make Volume III the best general treatise on Gothic architecture in one volume that has so far appeared in English, at least on this side of the ocean. The first chapter of Book XIV on the origin and evolution of the Italian Renaissance is an analysis at once keen, profound, and broad. Chapters ii on Italian palaces and iii on church architecture are almost as good. In a penetrating observation—one of many scattered through both volumes—the author remarks that "while it is true the Italians were the least constructive nation in Europe, it is also by a strange contrariety true that in the history of Renaissance architecture it was only the Italians who were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called upon to face big constructive problems and facts." In this, as in many other passages dealing with broad aspects of his subject, there is, no doubt, matter for controversy, or at least discussion; but at least these passages reveal originality and independence of thought, and an insight very different from the superficial way in which so many writers have been accustomed to follow beaten tracks to trite conclusions. The author sees in the early Renaissance work in Italy, particularly Brunelleschi's, a natural and gradual transition from the Gothic; he fully recognizes the persistence of classic traditions in Italian mediæval architecture as the originating source of the classic details of the early Renaissance; there is in his text no echo of Fergusson's condemnation of all post-Gothic styles as "imitative or copying styles," or of Moore's equally destructive criticism of them for not conforming to the structural logic of the French Gothic.

As already observed, however, the treatment of the post-Gothic styles in this volume is not equal in thoroughness or comprehensiveness to that of the Gothic styles. The limited space the author has allowed for the enormous mass of material available precludes the detailed criticism of many important monuments, restricts the amount of space devoted to even the most important, and excludes entirely from notice many that might well have been mentioned and illustrated. The preference is given to the earlier phases of the style; the author's interest appears to dwindle with every decade after 1525 in Italy and 1600 in France, and many a really notable building of the later Renaissance is left out altogether. The value of what the author has given us is so real and so great that we regret the more that he has not covered with equal or at least proportionate fulness these later as well as the earlier phases.

To sum up our estimate of these two volumes: they follow the general plan and scope of the first two, as laid out by Mr. Sturgis. In reviewing the second volume of the series we observed that "Mr. Sturgis is the examiner, the analyzer, the critic, rather than the historian." Mr. Frothingham in his two volumes is more of an historian than was Mr. Sturgis; but it is still the analytical idea that prevails over the historical. Thus the monuments of the Italian Renaissance are treated under the heads of Palaces and Churches, after the chapter on Origins and Evolution; the same period of time is gone over twice, in some cases thrice. The historical march of architectural progress is lost sight of, broken up by these constant retracings of its steps. To some extent, however, a general historical view is presented in the introductions to each book. These surveys are in themselves admirable, and offer some compensation for what seem to the reviewer the deficiencies inherent in the plan adopted in the earlier volumes and followed by Mr. Sturgis's successor.

While the pagination begins anew in each volume, the illustrations are consecutively numbered from No. 1 in Volume III to 855 in Volume IV, which is a bit confusing at first. They are nearly all half-tone prints of excellent quality, so distributed as to be truly illustrative of the text. The architectural diagrams are chiefly taken from Choisy and Viollet-le-Duc. Architects will wish there were more of the diagrams, and especially of the plans. A comparison of these volumes in this respect with Simpson's "History of Architectural Development" is instructive by the contrast. A most unfortunate oversight by the publishers deserves to be noticed here. They have failed to include a very important full-page plate of the model of St. Maclou at Rouen, referred to in the text in three places as "Plate I, opposite page 122." As this model and its importance in exemplifying the methods of architectural practice in the fifteenth century were Mr. Frothingham's own personal discovery, the omission of the plate appears as an injustice to him, as well as an annoyance to the reader. In other respects the make-up of the volumes is excellent; the clear printing and broad margins, the excellence of the illustrations, and the fulness of the table of contents and indexes, are highly creditable to the author and publishers. The proofreading, careful in the main, is not wholly impeccable, especially in the index, where, for example, Xanthus is printed Janthus, Labrouste is Labrauste (also in the text, iv, 326); S. Giorgio becomes S. Georgio, SS. Giovanni e Paolo is SS. Giovanie Paolo, Scuola is Scoula, Sarvistan is Sarvistau, Vecchio appears as Veccio, Haarlem as Haarlen, and so on. But such slips are rare in the text. The great weight of these volumes, printed on the heaviest of well-loaded plate-paper, is a physical inconvenience which one will gladly bear with in view of the value of their contents, their thorough scholarship, breadth of view, and sanity of criticism.

A new monthly magazine, the *Art World*, visibly announces its conservative tendency by a cover design of a triumphal arch enclosing a bust of Zeus. It promises championship of all forms of ideal art, and war to the knife on decadence. It offers rather little illustration for an art magazine, but that little of high quality. Every month there will be a wood-cut by Timothy Cole after an American painting. This month the choice falls on Thomas Cole, the father of American landscape. The most notable article is by Kenyon Cox, opening a series on the topic, "What Is Painting?" Dr. Theo. B. Hyslop deals with "Post-illusionism and the Insane." Glen Brown discusses Paul Bartlett's new pediment for the Capitol. August Thomas contributes an "Inquiry Concerning the Drama," Daniel Chester French "A Sculptor's Reminiscences of Emerson," and there is a poem by George Sterling. There is nothing startling in the number except intermittent abuse of the radical modern movements by the editor, F. Wellington Ruckstuhl. Sympathizing as we do in the main with his point of view, we are distressed at a kind of tasteless vehemence in his method, for it must certainly incite the unregenerate rather to mirth than to repentance. A pseudonymous contributor, "Petronius Arbiter," distinguishes among great, clever, and degenerate art, apropos of Raphael, Velasquez, and Degas, with an indiscretion recalling the real Petronius, but without his wit. The journal is well made and of promising scope, if it can present a united front of that academic decorum which it is its aim to defend. We shall await further issues with a mixture of expectation and concern. The price is $3.50 a year, for which the wood-cuts of Cole alone are more than a money's worth.

Finance

THE DECLINE ON THE STOCK EXCHANGE.

It will doubtless remain a matter of controversy how far the convulsive decline on the Stock Exchange last week represented response to the President's note to the belligerents, how far the effects of Secretary Lansing's incomprehensible blunder, how far continued apprehension over financial conditions which may follow returning peace, and how far the inevitable readjustment from a hugely inflated speculation, caught in a money-market "squeeze." The essential fact is, that the general liquidation, which the Stock Exchange was sooner or later bound to undergo, has been effected with unexpected promptness, rapidity, and thoroughness. Fundamentally, the financial position is as much strengthened by the process as it was by the more deliberate liquidation of last January.

With so numerous and varied influences combining in this present instance to promote the downward movement, the course of prices on the Stock Exchange cannot be taken, to the usual extent, as a forecast of the general situation. December markets, in a period of money tension, rarely perform that prophetic function; indeed, even the sweeping reaction with which the present year began did not, as we now know, give any accurate forecast of the financial and industrial history of 1916. The strong probability is that when the markets have settled down to something like equanimity, on their new and much more reasonable level of prices, sober judgment and plain common sense will resume their influence over even Wall Street's deductions as to the economic future.

Many incidents go to show the extent to which financial prophecies are being colored by the agitations of the moment. The statement on foreign trade for November came into Wall Street's vision in the market's existing mood, almost as if it were an echo of long-past financial history. It is doubtless true, as a matter of fact, that this remarkable showing points to causes which probably will not as a whole prevail with the same force and scope that have hitherto attended them. If actual peace negotiations were presently to get under way, it would not be long before the huge total of exports was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diminished. Nobody has imagined that an outward trade of $500,000,000 a month and a surplus of exports well above $300,000,000 could possibly continue after the contracts for munitions of war had been worked off.

But the absolutely record-breaking November exports of $517,000,000, the eleven months' exports $1,766,000,000 above 1915, and $2,711,000,000 above any other year, are not merely a reminder of what, in due course, we shall see no longer in our foreign trade. The facts that for 1916 and 1915 combined our excess of exports over imports will have been $3,200,000,000 greater than in any other two consecutive years of the country's history, and that the proceeds of this enormous windfall have been used to redeem our own foreign obligations, to invest in sound foreign securities, and to strengthen enormously the country's gold reserve fund, have quite as much significance for our longer economic future as they lately had for the economic present.

This is not least so in the matter of gold imports, which for the eleven months alone were $120,000,000 greater even than last year's enormous figure. A year ago, the financial wiseacres predicted the disastrous situation when Europe, after the war, should "draw away our gold." Six months later, they were shaking their heads over the necessarily ruinous consequences of the "flood of gold" itself, and solemnly discussing whether Europe would not see fit to "demonetize" that precious metal—in behalf of what, since Europe is shorter of silver now than of gold, was not exactly obvious.

Perhaps the next stage of this marching and countermarching in the field of economic guess-work will be lamenting over the probable future decrease of our gold importations below the present $50,000,000 monthly average. But the point on which people of less impulsive temperament will probably fix their attention is the fact that possession of this huge hoard of gold, when the war actually terminates, along with our immense and newly acquired foreign credits, will equip our market in a peculiarly important way for continuing to finance the outside world in the period of readjustment.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

MISCELLANEOUS.

Amicis, E. de. My Last Friend Dog Dick. Translated by J. G. Sista. Edited by M. M. Burt. Privately printed.
Brown, C. A Register of Middle English Religious and Didactic Verse. Part I. List of Manuscripts. Oxford University Press.
Eastman, M. Journalism Versus Art. Knopf. $1 net.
Koopman, H. L. The Booklover and His Books. Boston Book Co. $2 net.
Roland. The Future of Militarism. An Examination of F. Scott Oliver's "Ordeal by Battle." London: T. Fisher Unwin. 2s. 6d. net.
Tagore, R. Stray Birds. Macmillan. $1.50 net.
Tavenner, E. Studies in Magic from Latin Literature. Columbia University Press.
Taylor, M. The Confessions of a Thug. Edited by C. W. Stewart. Oxford University Press. 1s. 3d. net.
The Arden Shakespeare Series: A Midsummer Night's Dream. As You Like It. The Merchant of Venice. Heath.
The Deportation of Women and Girls from Lille. Doran. 50 cents.
The Ohio-Michigan Boundary. Vol. I. Ohio Coöperative Topographic Survey. Ohio State Reformatory.
Van Langenhove, F. The Growth of a Legend. Putnam. $1.25 net.
Vespucci Reprints, Texts, and Studies. Vols. II, IV, V, VI, VII. Princeton University Press.
Whitney, B. A. What to Wear. A Book for Women. Battle Creek, Michigan: Good Health Pub. Co.
Williams, C. R. The Cliosophic Society, Princeton University. Princeton University Press. $1.50 net.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

Leuba, J. H. The Belief in God and Immortality. Boston: Sherman, French. $2 net.
Mylne, L. G. The Holy Trinity. Longmans, Green. $2.50 net.
Thwing, C. F. The Ministry. An Appeal to College Men. Pilgrim Press. 50 cents.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS.

Barnet, G. E., and McCabe, D. A. Mediation, Investigation, and Arbitration in Industrial Disputes. Appleton. $1.25 net.
Fetter, F. A. Modern Economic Problems. Century.
Jones, E. D. The Administration of Industrial Enterprises. Longmans, Green. $2 net.
Madsen, A. W. The State as Manufacturer and Trader. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 7s. 6d. net.
Mavor, J. Government Telephones. Moffat, Yard. $1 net.
Parsons, E. C. Social Rule. Putnam. $1 net.
Purcell, E. D. Forty Years at the Criminal Bar. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 6s. net.
Scheftel, Y. The Taxation of Land Value. Houghton Mifflin. $2 net.
Storey, H. The Paris Conference and Trade After the War. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 2d.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Alvord, C. W. The Mississippi Valley in British Politics. Vols. I and II. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co. $10 net.
The Reminiscences of the Right Hon. Lord O'Brien, Lord Chief of Ireland. Edited by His Daughter, Hon. Georgina O'Brien. Longmans, Green. $2.50 net.
Turczynowicz, L. de. When the Prussians Came to Poland. Putnam. $1.25 net.

TRAVEL.

Paton, D. Egyptian Records of Travel in Western Asia. Vol. II. Princeton University Press. $7.50 net.

POETRY.

Darrow, L. E. From Idaho to You. Boston: Badger. $1 net.
Evans, D. Nine Poems from a Valetudinarian. Philadelphia: Nicholas L. Brown.
Harding, R. G. A Lark Went Singing and Other Poems. Minneapolis, Minn.: Edmund D. Brooks. $1 net.
J. T. The Singer. Boston: Badger. $1 net.
Sanborn, P. Vie de Bordeaux. Philadelphia: Nicholas L. Brown. $1.
Taylor, D. F. Mystery of the Lady of the Casino. Boston: Badger. 75 cents.

SCIENCE.

Bailey, L. H. The Pruning Manual. 18th edition revised and reset. Macmillan. $2 net.
Kelsey, C. The Physical Basis of Society. Appleton. $2 net.

DRAMA AND MUSIC.

MacKaye, P. The Canterbury Pilgrims. Macmillan. $1 net.

ART.

Bailey, A. E. The Gospel in Art. Pilgrim Press. $3 net.
Berenson, B. Venetian Painting in America. The Fifteenth Century. New York: Frederic F. Sherman. $4.
The Russian School of Painting. Translated by A. Yarmolinsky. Knopf. $4 net.

TEXTBOOKS.

Gould, C. N. Handy German Grammar. Scott, Foresman. 50 cents net.
Houghton, H. G. The Elements of Public Speaking. Ginn. $1.40.
Moulton, F. R. An Introduction to Astronomy. New and revised edition. Macmillan. $2.25.
Myers, G. W., and Atwood, G. E. Elementary Algebra. Scott, Foresman. $1.
The Lake English Classics Series: The Æneid of Virgil. English Popular Ballads. The Mill on the Floss. Life of Nelson. Scott, Foresman & Co.

Ready This Week

THE ANDES OF SOUTHERN PERU

By ISAIAH BOWMAN, author of "South America" and "Forest Physiography."

With detailed topographic maps and illustrations from photographs. 8vo. $3.00 net.

Henry Holt & Co. 34 W. 33d St. New York

A TRIP TO SOUTH AMERICA

By S. M. WAXMAN

Exercises in Spanish composition based on twenty-five conversations, discussing preparations for a journey to South America and a visit to Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, and Santiago de Chile. Each lesson contains a verb drill.

Cloth. iii+100 pages. 50 cents.

D. C. HEATH & CO., Boston, New York, Chicago

Studies in History, Economics and Public Law

Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.

New Volume, lxxiii, cloth, $4.50

This volume contains the following monographs which may be had separately in paper covers, at the prices stated.

THE CHARTIST MOVEMENT IN ITS SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS. Part I. (No. 171).

By FRANK F. ROSENBLATT, Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. 248. *Paper covers,* $2.00.

THE DECLINE OF THE CHARTIST MOVEMENT (No. 172).

By PRESTON WILLIAM SLOSSON, Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. 216. *Paper covers,* $2.00.

CHARTISM AND THE CHURCHES: A Study in Democracy. (No. 173).

By HAROLD UNDERWOOD FAULKNER, Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. 152. *Paper covers,* $1.25.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers

PUTNAMS BOOKS

Social Stationery

Correct Forms—Best Materials—
Skilled Workmanship—Prompt Delivery
Work done at the Knickerbocker Press
Samples and Estimates Submitted

Putnams 2 West 45th St., N. Y. just west of 5th Ave.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lists of Publications in sciences, philosophy, philology, history, economics, will be sent upon request.

The University of California Press
BERKELEY, CAL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED